



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ



3 2106 00225 3281



IBSEN IN ENGLAND



By MIRIAM A. FRANC

82

IBSEN IN ENGLAND



By MIRIAM A. FRANC

IBSEN IN ENGLAND

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

IBSEN IN ENGLAND

BY

MIRIAM ALICE FRANC

///

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY



BOSTON
THE FOUR SEAS COMPANY
1919

Copyright, 1919, by
THE FOUR SEAS COMPANY

The Four Seas Press
Boston, Mass., U. S. A.

PT
8900
G7
F7

PREFACE

SINCE Ibsen has influenced modern English drama as has no other single playwright, and since Ibsen aroused the most interesting controversy in the history of the modern English theatre, it is essential that the student of contemporary English drama should thoroughly understand the part that Ibsen played in the literary and theatrical England of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This thesis is the result of an attempt to gather together in a single volume the material necessary to an appreciation of Ibsen's place in the history of English drama.

For much of the material on Gosse's introduction of Ibsen to England, I am indebted to F. C. Hansen's baccalaureate thesis on "Ibsen in England", University of Wisconsin. In Dr. Lee M. Hollander's bibliography in "Speeches and New Letters of Ibsen", there may be found a list of many of the translations, performances, and commentaries on Ibsen in England and America. As far as I have been able to ascertain, these have been the only detailed works on the subject of Ibsen in England, and both Mr. Hansen and Dr. Hollander have limited themselves to only a portion of the field.

I wish to express my warm gratitude to Dr. Robert M. Gay, formerly of Goucher College, for his suggestion of the subject of this thesis, and for his never-failing

IBSEN

interest and encouragement. It is a pleasure and a privilege to acknowledge my indebtedness to Dr. Cornelius Weygandt, under whose direction the work was done, for his keen criticism and friendly interest throughout. I am indebted to Dr. Clarence G. Child for his kind interest in the thesis. I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my obligation to Dr. Felix E. Schelling, Dr. Josiah H. Penniman, Dr. Arthur H. Quinn, Dr. Weygandt, and Dr. Child, who have guided me in my study of literature.

M. A. F.

University of Pennsylvania

May, 1918

CONTENTS

I. IBSEN'S INTRODUCTION TO ENGLAND . . .	11
II. <u>THE IBSEN CONTROVERSY</u>	24
III. ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF IBSEN . . .	57
IV. PERFORMANCES OF IBSEN IN ENGLAND . .	76
V. PARODIES AND SEQUELS TO IBSEN DRAMAS .	120
VI. <u>IBSEN'S INFLUENCE ON ENGLISH DRAMA</u> .	129
VII. THE ENGLISH STAGE AND IBSEN	151
APPENDIX A. ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF IBSEN	163
APPENDIX B. PERFORMANCES OF IBSEN IN ENGLAND	168

IBSEN IN ENGLAND



IBSEN IN ENGLAND

I.

IBSEN'S INTRODUCTION TO ENGLAND

IN 1871 a young Englishman, Edmund Gosse, was sent to Norway as correspondent for the *Spectator* and *Fraser's Magazine*. Gosse, then a mere boy of twenty-two, was already known in London as the author of delicate and subtle verses, and as a literary critic of considerable promise. Gosse was one of the few men of letters in England who had any knowledge of Scandinavian languages, and one of the still smaller group who knew Scandinavian literature.

It is very possible that Gosse had seen some of Ibsen's work before he went to Norway, but undoubtedly it is to this journey that Gosse owed his real introduction to Ibsen. In 1871 "*De unges forbund*" ("The League of Youth") was only two years old, and all Norway was still rankling under the satire on its political life. "*Kaerlighendens komedie*" ("Love's Comedy") had been written in 1862, but Norway had not yet recovered from its shocked surprise. "*Haermaendene paa Helgeland*" ("Vikings at Helgeland") and "*Kongs-emnerne*" ("The Pretenders") had brought Ibsen into popular favor a decade before, and had given him a permanent place on the Norwegian stage. "*Brand*" had appeared in 1866 and

"Peer Gynt" in 1867, and already discriminating critics were pointing to these plays as Norway's greatest poetic achievements. And "Digte" ("Poems"), Ibsen's collection of his short poems, appeared in 1871, the very year of Gosse's visit to Norway, and again brought the poet before the public. In all of Gosse's brilliant career as a critic, surely fortune never smiled on him as kindly as she did in his twenty-second year, when she sent him to Norway and introduced him to the works of Norway's greatest poet, at a time when Ibsen's very name was unknown to England.

Twenty-two years after the publication of Ibsen's first play, and five years after the publication of two of his greatest works, "Brand" and "Peer Gynt," there appeared in the *Spectator* of March 16, 1872, the first mention of Ibsen in an English periodical. The article, a book review on "Digte," was headed "Ibsen's New Poems." It began: "The distinguished Norwegian writer whose name stands at the head of this article has won his laurels almost exclusively in dramatic literature. His plays are highly esteemed among his countrymen and have gained him a place in their estimation second to none of his contemporaries. At last he has gathered together the lyrical poems of his later years in the little volume now under review, and they are found to possess all the grace and vigour that his earlier work would lead one to expect." A short criticism of the poems, stressing their "pensiveness" as well as their "grotesque indignation", is followed by an account of Ibsen's life and of the Norwegian literature of his youth, the works of Wergeland, Welhaven, and A. Munch. The article finally calls at-

tention to "Gildet paa Solhoug" ("The Feast at Solhoug") and "Kongs-emnerne" ("The Pretenders"), but omits all mention of "Brand" and "Peer Gynt", probably because a subsequent review was to treat of them. The review was only one and a half columns long. It was unsigned, but three years later, in an article in the *Spectator* of March 27, 1875, Gosse acknowledged his authorship of the March, 1872, article: "It is three years since we have had the pleasure of introducing through these columns, for the first time in England, the greatest modern Scandinavian poet."

Gosse sent this first English article on Ibsen to the dramatist. Ibsen was delighted with his introduction to the English public, and wrote to Gosse from Dresden on April 2, 1872: "I could not wish a better or more laudatory introduction to a foreign nation than you have given me in your excellent review; nor is there any nation to whose reading public I should feel it a greater honour to be made known than yours. If it can be done through your friendly and capable intervention, I shall be everlastingly indebted to you." On April 30, Ibsen wrote from Dresden: "I shall consider myself most fortunate if you decide to translate one or more of my books; but I shall, of course, be equally indebted to you if you continue to draw attention to my works by means of articles in English papers. I presume this would contribute in no small degree to removing the difficulties of finding a publisher."

Evidently Gosse outlined to Ibsen his plan of campaign, for on April 24, 1872, Ibsen wrote from Dresden to his publisher, Hegel, in Copenhagen: "I wonder if you hap-

pen to have read a review of my poems in the English weekly paper, the Spectator, which has been reprinted in part in the Morgenblad? Similar reviews of my other works are to be published, to prepare the way for a translation of them which it is proposed to issue in England and America. The leader in this undertaking is Mr. Edmund Gosse, an official in the British Museum in London."

Gosse continued his work of making Ibsen known to England by a review of "Peer Gynt" in the Spectator of July 20, 1872. This article, again printed anonymously, was headed only "A Norwegian Drama." Gosse began: "It is not too much to say that within the green covers of this book, the Norwegian language received a fuller and more splendid expression than in any previous work. It comes from the hand of Henrik Ibsen, a poet who is fast gaining for himself that European fame which nothing but the remoteness of his mother-tongue has hitherto denied him." He described the legendary material used, and added: "Out of this legendary waif Ibsen has evolved a character of wonderful subtlety and liveliness, and hung around it draperies of allegorical satire. 'Peer Gynt' is an epigram on the Norway of to-day; it satirizes, as in a nutshell, everything vapid, or maudlin, or febrile in the temper of the nation; in sparkling verse it lashes the extravagances of the various parties that divide the social world." Gosse then contrasted "Peer Gynt" with "Brand," gave a lengthy synopsis of "Peer Gynt" act by act, and defended Ibsen from the charge of being a "negative" satirist. In conclusion he said, in part: "We have said enough to show that this is a great and powerful work. It would be rash to pronounce anything impos-

sible to the author of the third act of 'Peer Gynt', but it would seem that his very power and fluency are dangerous to him; the book is not without marks of haste, and there is a general sense of incongruity and disjointedness."

Gosse's third article was printed in the Academy of August 1, 1872. This article, a shorter one, reviewed "Kongs-emnerne" ("The Pretenders"). Gosse said: "The dramatic power displayed in the poem quite raises it out of any mere local interest and gives it a claim to be judged at a European tribunal." He gave the story of the play, and compared it with "Hertog Skule" by A. Munch.

In October, 1872, Gosse published in Fraser's Magazine a long article on "Norwegian Poetry since 1814." This remarkable literary history treated of Schwach, Bjerregaard, M. C. Hansen, Wergeland, Welhaven, M. B. Landstad, A. Munch, Asbjørnsen, and Moe. Ibsen was then introduced: "We now reach the name which stands highest among the poets of the new school, a star that is still in the ascendant, and on whom high hopes are built by all who desire the intellectual prosperity of Norway." There was a short account of Ibsen's life and works, and a very capable English translation of the lyric "Agnes" from "Brand". The article closed with an account of Bjørnsen.

On October 14, 1872, Ibsen wrote from Dresden thanking Gosse for the review of "Peer Gynt" in the Spectator of July 20. "A better, clearer, or more sympathetic interpretation of my poem I could not desire." As to Gosse's unfavorable criticism, Ibsen said, "I have no doubt there is reason." He also thanked Gosse for his re-

view of "The Pretenders" in the Academy: "What I have said in regard to the essay on 'Peer Gynt' is applicable to that of 'The Pretenders' also." He thanked Gosse for the article on Norwegian poetry in Fraser's Magazine for October, saying that all Norway was indebted to him for his review of Norwegian literature. In a postscript, Ibsen added: "I have forgotten to thank you more especially for your translation of the little poem in 'Brand' which seems to me most beautifully done."

In this year, 1872, there was published in Bergen a collection of "Norwegian and Swedish Poems" translated into English by J. A. D. The translator was Johan Andreas Dahl, a native of Bergen who had lived in America for ten years, and taught English in Norway. The little volume included a rather poor translation of Ibsen's "Terje Vigen", that sentimental ballad strangely unlike Ibsen, which is his most popular short poem in Norway. Dahl was neither a poet, nor the possessor of a very idiomatic knowledge of English, and his translation suffers accordingly. It is a very commonplace version of Ibsen's most commonplace poem. The volume had but few English readers.

In the years 1872 to 1874, Gosse again travelled through the Scandinavian countries, studying the literature and observing the people. He met there many prominent men, among them Hans Christian Andersen. Articles describing these trips appeared in Cornhill's Magazine, the Spectator, and the Academy.

Gosse's first elaborate article on Ibsen, the one that is often mistakenly quoted as Ibsen's introduction to England, appeared in the Fortnightly Review of January 1,

1873. "Ibsen the Norwegian Satirist" began: "There is now living at Dresden a middle-aged Norwegian gentleman who walks in and out among the inhabitants of that gay city, observing all things, observed of few, retired, contemplative, unaggressive. Occasionally he sends a roll of Ms. off to Copenhagen, and the Danish papers announce that a new poem of Ibsen's is about to appear. This announcement causes more stir than perhaps any other can, among literary circles in Scandinavia, and the elegant Swedish journalists point out how graceful an opportunity it would be for the illustrious poet to leave his voluntary exile and return to be smothered in flowers and flowery speeches. Norwegian friends, expressing themselves more tersely, think that the greatest Norse writer ought to come home to live. Still, however, he remains in Germany, surrounded by the nationality least pleasing to his taste, within daily earshot of sentiments inexpressibly repugnant to him, watching, noting, digging deeper and deeper into the dark places of modern life, developing more and more a vast and sinister genius." This last sentence, written at a time when "The League of Youth" was the only one of Ibsen's "social dramas" that had been written, sounds strangely prophetic. Gosse then noted that among the younger men of Germany, France, Italy, and Denmark there was not "a single accredited world poet"; but declared, "It is my firm belief that in the Norwegian, Henrik Ibsen, the representative of a land unknown in the literary annals of Europe, such a poet is found." Following a brief history of Ibsen's life, he gave a synopsis of "Love's Comedy" and excellent translations of several of Falk's scenes. Gosse's

synopsis of "Brand" indicates a lack of the fullest appreciation of the play. He gave a brief synopsis of "Peer Gynt" which he selected as Ibsen's greatest work. He translated delightfully the songs welcoming Peer Gynt as prophet, and the speech of the Orang Outang champion. Of these plays Gosse said that they form "a great satiric trilogy, perhaps for sustained vigor of expression, for affluence of execution, and for brilliance of dialogue, the greatest of modern times. They form at present Ibsen's principal and foremost claim to immortality; their influence over thought in the North has been boundless, and sooner or later they will win for their author the homage of Europe."

In a letter dated February 20, 1873, Ibsen wrote from Dresden that he would send his forthcoming book "Kejser og Galilaeer" ("Emperor and Galilean") first to Gosse. "It is very natural that I should send it first to you, for I value your criticism more than that of any of my other friends—and this because of the real, intimate poetic understanding revealed in everything that you have been good enough to write about me. How can I sufficiently thank you for your last exhaustive article? I shall not attempt to do so; I will only say to you that it made me very happy . . . The translations, from 'Love's Comedy' and 'Peer Gynt' are excellent; I do not know of anything in them I could wish different."

The Academy of April 1, 1873, announced that "the great Norwegian poet, Ibsen, whose works are just now beginning to be known here", has finished "Emperor and Galilean". The Spectator for December 27, 1873, had a three column review of "Kejser og Galilaeer" by Gosse.

The reviewer condemned the play as only partially successful. He said: "In effect he has hardly hit as high as he aimed; 'Kejser og Galilæer' ('Emperor and Galilean') is a work full of power and interest, studded with lofty passages, but not a complete poem." The second part "is afflicted with a sense of flatness and deadness that the author in vain struggles to throw off." The chief causes of failure are the facts that the play is written in prose—"as if Orpheus should travel hellwards without his ivory lyre"—and that Julian is not sufficiently big to sustain the play.

Ibsen defended his use of prose in "Kejser og Galilæer" in a letter to Gosse dated January, 1874. He wished to depict ordinary human beings and to emphasize their commonplace human attributes. And so he would not allow them to use "the language of the gods."

In December, 1873, Gosse published his volume of poems "On Viol and Flute." This contained "The Poet's Song" from "Love's Comedy", as it had been translated in "Ibsen the Norwegian Satirist", *Fortnightly Review*, January 1, and the "Agnes" song from "Brand", first translated in "Norwegian Poetry since 1814" in *Fraser's Magazine* of October, 1872. The poems reproduce excellently the spirit of the originals and are in themselves beautiful English verse. The volume also contained Gosse's "Sonnet to Ibsen." Ibsen was greatly pleased with the young critic's tribute.

In an article on "The Present Condition in Norway" in *Fraser's Magazine* for February, 1874, Gosse treated of the political, economic, and social conditions of the

country, but managed to include mention of Ibsen as "the greatest genius that Norway has yet produced."

The Academy of July 25, 1874, briefly noted the third Norwegian edition of "Haermaendene paa Helgeland" ("Vikings at Helgeland"), and praised Ibsen as "the greatest living dramatist and lyrical of Scandinavia." The same periodical in October, 1874, gave an account of Ibsen's visit to Norway, and reproduced in full Ibsen's speech to the students of the University.

The Academy of March 6, 1875, called attention to the "Ny illustreret Tidende" for February 14, which contained a portrait of Mr. Gosse and a biography by Mr. Winter-Hjelm, the editor, who thanked Gosse for his efforts "to further among his countrymen the knowledge of what is best" in modern Scandinavian literature.

Ibsen's forty-seventh birthday and the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of "Catilina" were mentioned by the Academy of March 16, 1875. In the *Spectator* of March 27, Gosse had a short account of "Ibsen's Jubilee." As he remarked, three years had elapsed since he first introduced Ibsen to England, and he looked with very pardonable pride on what he had accomplished, practically single-handed, since March 16, 1872. "Since then his name, at least, has become familiar to the British public; his greatest works reviewed in various English journals; and the particulars of his life dwelt upon with more or less fullness."

The year 1876 saw the first complete translation into English of an Ibsen drama, "Emperor and Galilean; a Drama in Two Parts", translated from the Norwegian by Catherine Ray. Miss Ray's translation has merit. It is

a careful piece of work but gives only a very colorless interpretation of Ibsen's vivid drama. The volume had a very limited circulation in England. As a pioneer in the task of making Ibsen's plays available to the English reading public, Miss Ray deserves much praise for her courage and for her faithful work.

In the Athenaeum of February 12, 1876, and in the Academy of June 10, 1876, there appeared accounts of Miss Ray's translation. Gosse, who wrote the Academy criticism, pronounced Miss Ray's work conscientious and accurate.

There is considerable doubt as to the date of publication of the little volume, "Translations from the Norse, by a B. S. S." The probability is that pamphlets containing the translations were published between 1876 and 1878, though most authorities agree on the earlier date. This book was issued from Gloucester by the British Society of Scandinavians for private circulation. It was never put on the market, and so reached only a limited circle of readers. The translator, A. Johnstone, selected from Ibsen's works "Terje Vigen", which he reproduced partly in verse and partly in prose, "En fugle vise" ("A Bird's Song") and "Edderfuglein" ("Eiderduck"), both of these from "Digte", "Vuggevisen" ("Cradle Song") from "The Pretenders", and Act I from the 1875 edition of "Catilina", with a summary of the following two acts. This is, up to date, the only English translation from "Catilina". This first of Ibsen plays is the only one included by Ibsen in his Collected Works that has never been fully translated into English. Johnstone's translations are mediocre and lack any poetic quality.

"Samfundets stotter" ("Pillars of Society") was written in 1877. On January 12, 1878, in the *Academy*, Gosse wrote a short criticism of the play. The *Academy* of March 23, 1878, first mentioned the possibility of presenting Ibsen on the stage. The article asserted that "Pillars of Society" was being translated into German and was being played or rehearsed in thirty German theatres, and added: "If English managers had any real enterprise they would secure a version of such a piece as this for the London stage."

In 1879 Edmund Gosse published his collection of essays, "Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe." About a fifth of the book is taken up by a revision of the "Norwegian Poetry since 1814" of October, 1872, and an essay on "Henrik Ibsen", compiled from various essays in periodicals. The essay on Norwegian poetry is an exact reproduction of the *Fraser's Magazine* article, except that the paragraph on Ibsen is omitted, and translations from other writers are added. The "Henrik Ibsen" essay includes "Ibsen, the Norwegian Satirist" of the *Fortnightly Review* of January 1, 1873, the "Agnes" song, omitted from the essay on Norwegian poetry, the review of "Kjæser og Galilæer" from the *Spectator* of December 27, 1873, the review of "Kongs-emnerne" ("The Pretenders") from the *Academy* of August 1, 1872, and a short account of "De unges forbund" ("The League of Youth"), not published in any periodical. This book had a large circulation, and was reprinted in 1883 and 1890.

With Gosse's book giving permanent form to his gallant efforts to introduce Ibsen to England, this first period in the history of English criticism of Ibsen comes to a

close. In 1880 William Archer entered the field and first presented an Ibsen play on the English stage. Ibsen's reception in England then became more a matter of stage history than a matter of literary criticism. Gosse's important work was the introduction of Ibsen into England by means of laudatory criticisms published in the various London periodicals. This accomplished, Gosse retired from the field and made no important contributions to the Ibsen campaign until 1890, when he published the first of his Ibsen translations.

Gosse's campaign was waged practically single-handed. From 1872 to 1879 there appeared in English periodicals ten essays on Ibsen of any considerable length. Nine of these were written by Gosse. This period also produced the Ibsen essay in "Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe", also by Gosse. Gosse criticised at length Ibsen's lyrics, "Peer Gynt", "The Pretenders", "Love's Comedy", "Brand", "Emperor and Galilean", and "Pillars of Society". A speech of Ibsen's was printed in full in an English periodical. An entire play, "Emperor and Galilean" was translated by Miss Ray. Moreover, there were translations of Act I of "Catilina", "Terje Vigen" in two versions, two lyrics, a song from "The Pretenders", and, from Gosse's pen, scenes from "Love's Comedy", parts of "Peer Gynt", and a song from "Brand".

In 1879, Ibsen was not widely known in England. The attack by dramatic critics was necessary to make his name a household word. But Gosse had at least made Ibsen a name familiar to discriminating lovers of literature. The way had been paved for Archer's active campaign for the popularization of Ibsen in England.

II.

THE IBSEN CONTROVERSY

OF ALL the artists of the nineteenth century, Wagner and Ibsen stand out as the best hated. Byron and Shelley faced abuse only in England; Manet was hated in Paris; the controversy over Nietzsche was comparatively a local affair. But like Wagner, Ibsen received from all Europe fervent praise and bitter blame. Like Wagner, Ibsen was an important figure in every artistic circle in Europe. His ideas might be liked or disliked, but it was impossible to ignore them. It is a common enough thing for an artist to be enthusiastically praised in his own country, and to be unknown abroad. It is a far more unusual thing for an artist to rouse the entire literary world—including his native country—to a passionate debate as to whether he is the great genius or the arch fool of his generation.

As in most countries, the Ibsen controversy in England was not a matter of literary criticism. It belonged solely to the realm of the theatrical critic. Published translations of Ibsen, commentaries on Ibsen, roused practically no adverse criticism. For them there was little but praise. But performances of Ibsen dramas set the entire theatrical world by the ears, and roused a storm of abuse that would have daunted any men less enthusiastic than Ibsen's sponsors.

In 1880 Ibsen was unknown in England. Archer says

of 1880: "At that time, however, there were probably not more than half-a-dozen people in England to whom the name of Henrik Ibsen conveyed any meaning. Indeed, I knew of only one—Mr. Edmund Gosse. 'Henry Gibson!' said an editor to whom I had proposed an article on the Norwegian dramatist, 'Who in the world is he?'" Gradually, by a few unimportant translations and performances, Ibsen's name became known to a few. But it was not until 1889 that Ibsen gained any fame in England.

On June 7, 1889, Mr. Charrington and Miss Achurch presented "A Doll's House" at the Novelty Theatre. The play was a shock to the home-loving Englishman. It found, however, many advocates. The Athenaeum of June 15 said: "Ibsen *au naturel* has at length been seen in London, and has even been found not displeasing to the English palate . . . The whole is not only defensible, it is fine." R. H. Hervey, in the Theatre of July 1, praised the truth of the play: "That many women are dissatisfied with their social position, and that more become so every day, is an undoubted fact; and of their dissatisfaction Ibsen has made himself the mouthpiece. . . . Those who have not read 'A Doll's House' or seen it acted, can have no conception with what a master-hand the characters are drawn."

But these critics did not have everything their own way. The redoubtable Clement Scott entered the field, and launched the first of his vivid attacks against Ibsen. The very number of the Theatre that contained Hervey's article, contained also one of Scott's on this play: "She is a wife no longer; the atmosphere is hideous, for he is

a 'strange man'. Her husband appeals to her, but in vain. He reminds her of her duty; she cannot recognize it. He appeals to her religion; she knows nothing about it. He recalls to her the innocent children; she has *herself* to look after now! It is all self, self, self! This is the ideal woman of the new creed a mass of aggregate conceit and self sufficiency, who leaves her home and deserts her friendless children because she has *herself* to look after. The 'strange man' who is the father of her children has dared to misunderstand her; she will scorn his regrets and punish him. Why should the men have it all their own way, and why should women be bored with the love of their children when they have themselves to study? . . . Having flung upon the stage a congregation of men and women without one spark of nobility in their nature, men without conscience and women without affection, an unlovable, unlovely and detestable crew—the admirers of Ibsen, failing to convince us of the excellence of such creatures, turn round and abuse the wholesome minds that cannot swallow such unpalatable doctrine, and the stage that has hitherto steered clear of such unpleasing realism."

Backward and forward the discussion went for a month or more, and then, for the time being, stopped. But the first step had been taken. The important critics had definitely allied themselves with the Ibsenites and the anti-Ibsenites, and the controversy was on.

In the Theatre of June 1, 1892, Mr. W. A. Lewis Bet-tany, under the title, "Criticism and the Renascent Drama", described the situation admirably: "Reviewers are, for the main part, split into two sections—the An-

cients and the Moderns. The present controversy between these rival schools has been running ever since 1880, and long before the production of 'A Doll's House' in 1889 there had been signs of the coming clash of critical opinion. Nevertheless, it may be fairly said that up to the year 1889 'the new criticism' had but a solitary champion—Mr. William Archer. Since then, however, several younger writers have rallied to Mr. Archer's support, and their accession to the ranks of the movement has materially altered the condition of affairs. Before the year of grace, the dispute had mainly consisted in an occasional difference of opinion between the opposing leaders . . . The events of the past three years have tended to make the struggle much more bitter and more personal. Ibsen has been thrown like an apple of discord among the critics."

Of all the critics who supported Ibsen dramas in these trying times, Archer was the recognized leader. To quote Mr. Gosse: "For a quarter of a century he was the protagonist in the fight against misconstruction and stupidity; with wonderful courage, with not less wonderful good temper and persistency, he insisted on making the true Ibsen take the place of the false, and in securing for him the recognition due to his genius."

Archer was one of the sanest and most unprejudiced of the critics of this period. Cool and unimpassioned, he was essentially the student. With his knowledge of French, German, and Norwegian, there went an understanding appreciation of the literature in these languages. But he was more than a student; he was a thinker and an innovator. Archer's articles were written with admirable

simplicity and clearness. His style was natural and easy. He had a finely combative wit, relieved by a vein of genial humor. Above all, his criticisms had frankness and sincerity. According to M. Filon, in his "The English Stage": "His articles were like a series of vigorous shakes to a sleeper. Any kind of effort, he maintained, was better than apathy."

Archer's lieutenant in the struggle was Mr. Arthur Bingham Walkley, "A. B. W." of the *Speaker*, the "Spectator" of the *Star*, and later the dramatic critic of the *Times*. Walkley was a scholar, prone to quote the Greek philosophers and poets in the original. But the influence of neither Aristotle nor the *Times* was able to put a damper on his lively wit and breezy cleverness. Light mockery, exquisite humor, subtle irony, bright vivacity—these characterized Walkley's delightful style. He did not feel himself a man with a mission, as did Archer. He merely expressed his capricious, but always sound, personal views. Though he liked the majority of Ibsen's plays, and supported them, vigorously turning his keen shafts of irony on his opponents, still he frankly disliked certain of them and publicly announced his opinion. Ibsen he admired; Ibsenites amused him, and he was able lightly to refer to the "Ibsen episode."

Shaw, in a letter of dedication to Walkley, prefixed to "Man and Superman", said: "The *Times* must sometimes thank its stars that new plays are not produced every day, since after each such event its gravity is compromised, its platitudes turned to epigrams, its portentousness to wit, its propriety to elegance, and even its decorum into naughtiness by criticisms which the traditions of the pa-

per do not allow you to sign at the end, but which you take care to sign with the most extravagant flourishes between the lines."

Mr. Bernard Shaw himself, though he entered the lists a little later than this first controversial period, was one of the most active supporters of Ibsen. His best criticisms of Ibsen appeared in the pages of the *Saturday Review*, where he discussed music, painting, and the theatre equally sagely. As a critic, Shaw was vivacious and brilliant. Particularly clever was his paradoxical humor, a strength and at the same time a weakness, since he often sacrificed exactness to humorous effect. Because of this literary exaggeration, Shaw at times failed to convince. Himself a preacher lacking all poetry, Shaw always regarded Ibsen as a moralist rather than a poet. He invariably stressed the didactic elements. Walkley, on the other hand, liked Ibsen because Ibsen's characters interested him as people.

Among the remaining dramatic critics who supported Ibsen there were many who did excellent service. Mr. Addison Bright of the *Lady's Pictorial* ardently admired Ibsen. Bright was eloquent but discursive. He had a remarkably thorough knowledge of modern literature. Mr. Justin Huntly McCarthy, of the *Sunday Sun* and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, had a flowing literary style. Mr. E. F. Spence, of the *Pictorial World* and the *Pall Mall Gazette*, was a lover of Ibsen, but a merciless critic of the average English play-wright. Mr. Joseph Knight, of the *Athenaeum*, had literary ability and considerable learning. He was chiefly interested in acting, and it was probably for the remarkable opportunities for acting in Ibsen plays

that he liked the Norwegian dramatist. Mr. W. Davenport Adams, of the Globe, was a faithful admirer of Ibsen. Adams had wide and all-embracing sympathy. His literary style was free and easy, almost careless. Mr. Jope Slade, of Land and Water and The Echo, was not wholly an Ibsenite. He indulged his prejudices frankly and made no pretence at impartiality. His criticisms were readable, highly-colored and picturesque. Mr. Max Beerbohm was occasionally a supporter of Ibsen. Keen, witty, clever, "Max" was influenced usually by the whim of the moment.

Of the opponents of Ibsen's dramas, by far the greatest figure was Clement Scott. Scott first appeared in the critical world in the barren eighteen-sixties and made a gallant effort to lift the stage from the rut into which it had fallen. Angered at Scott's merciless criticisms, Chatterton, then the "Napoleon of the Theatrical World", tried to have the young journalist dismissed from the Weekly Despatch, and even denied him entrance to his theatres. But James Mortimer, an American, founder of the London Figaro, opened his columns to Scott and gave him an opportunity of expressing his views. Archer in 1892 paid a tribute to Scott as "one—perhaps the chief—of the little group of men to whom we owe the theatrical revival of five and twenty years ago."

It was probably inevitable that the radical of the Robertsonian era should become the conservative of the Ibsen period. The autocrat of the theatrical world, a man earnest and sincere, he was a formidable opponent to the supporters of Ibsen. When the Ibsen dramas at

length gained recognition in England, it was only after a mighty struggle with a never-tiring adversary.

Scott owned and edited the Theatre during many years. He was theatrical critic at various times of the Sunday Times, the Observer, the London Illustrated News, Truth, and the Daily Telegraph. It was in the columns of the latter paper, with its circulation the greatest of any morning paper in the world, that Scott did his most important work in the Ibsen controversy. Scott was sentimental, prejudiced, and reactionary. He saw in Ibsen a foe to decency and a reviler of sacred things, and he was sincerely shocked. And with bitter resentment, he violently and coarsely abused Ibsen and all connected with him. To quote Mr. Shaw in "The Quintessence of Ibsenism": "He accused Ibsen of dramatic impotence, ludicrous amateurishness, nastiness, vulgarity, egotism, coarseness, absurdity, uninteresting verbosity, and 'suburbanity', declaring that he had taken ideas that would have inspired a great tragic poet and vulgarized and debased them in dull, hateful, loathsome, horrible plays."

Hatred of Ibsen became an obsession with Scott. Not content with violently adverse criticisms of all Ibsen plays, Scott dragged references to Ibsen into all sorts of unlikely places. For instance, in the Daily Telegraph of May 25, 1892, in a review of "Agatha" by Isaac Henderson, Scott wrote: "No more whining women and sickly men; no more inhuman mothers and monster husbands; no more blood-tainted youths and soured spinsters pouring forth a flood of their pestilential pessimism—only the heart of a woman laid bare by a woman; only a woman's nature, her passionate impulse, her fierce agony, her tre-

mendous temptation, her piteous repentance exposed to the very soul. We prefer the honest tears of Piccadilly to the snarls and sneers of the Strand. A Mercedes da Vigno—wicked woman as she is—is worth a cartload of scratchcats and Karins, of Noras and Heddas, of Rosmers and Rebeccas, with their defiant selfishness and ill-concealed blasphemies.”

Behind Scott in his fight again Ibsen stood almost the entire ranks of theatrical critics. Mr. Archer in “The Drama in the Doldrums” in the *Fortnightly Review* of August 1, 1892, said: “The New Critics are to the Old Critics in number as one to ten, in opportunities for disseminating their views as one to ten thousand. The New Criticism is utterly unrepresented in the great morning papers, with their largest circulations in the world. . . . Day after day and week after week the great dailies, the critical weeklies, the sporting papers, the comic papers, the illustrated papers, the theatrical trade papers, have been heaping on the Scandinavian drama in general, and Ibsen in particular, every sort of disparagement known to the rhetoric of journalism.”

Most prominent in this large group of anti-Ibsenites were: Mr. J. F. Nesbit, Mr. Alfred Watson, Mr. Wedmore, Mr. Moy Thomas and Mr. Edward Morton. Nesbit preceded Walkley on the *Times*. He was pessimistic, a believer in the necessary conventionality of the stage. His style was unpopular, scientific and unsympathetic. Watson of the *Standard* was a fearless, clever conventionalist. Wedmore was a self-satisfied, positive sort of critic. He figured in June 1889 in a delightful duel in the pages of the *Academy*. Wedmore concluded a criti-

cism of "A Doll's House" with—"The result of the judgment is that Henrik Ibsen must be said to be an interesting, but not a very great artist; that he must be confessed to be a missionary into the bargain—a missionary, perhaps before all—yet one whose mission is to some extent unnecessary, and to some extent injurious." To this Professor Herford answered that the missionary value of Ibsen is unimportant, and that Wedmore's criticism was "cockney". The indignant Wedmore retorted, and the duel went on furiously. Mr. Thomas was a critic of the old school, a radical who had become a reactionary. He was, however, always reasonable and sane. Morton was a self-confessed Philistine, and proud of it.

The Ibsen controversy was never wholly confined to the theatrical critics, though it was primarily their war. In the daily papers there appeared letters from men and women in every walk of life. Some had seen the Ibsen dramas and liked them; others had disliked them equally enthusiastically; and still others had never seen or read an Ibsen play, but did not think that the Censor should allow such immoral performances. Clergymen protested against Ibsen's blasphemies. Critics wrote about the dramatic qualities of the plays. Managers gave their ideas as to the practicability of Ibsen on the English stage. Novelists, poets, essayists, dramatists, all expressed themselves on the burning subject. Miss Marie Corelli declared that she hated "William Archer and his god, Ibsen", but Arthur Symonds, George Moore, Henry James, and countless others found praise for the Norwegian. The controversy stirred all England, as it had

stirred all Sweden, Denmark, and Germany, and as it was to stir all France, all America, and all Italy.

As early as 1882, in the preface of a translation of "A Doll's House", by Henrietta Frances Lord, Ibsen was introduced as a didactic dramatist who never took up his pen without the intention of preaching some gospel. Wilfully misunderstood, Ibsen has been represented as a sociologist, agnostic, atheist, realist, idealist, pessimist, anarchist, socialist, when in reality he is merely a dramatist. Believers in any cause found it comparatively easy to adjust his views to theirs, and to hail him as master.

Shaw fell into this error, in a speech delivered before the Fabian Society on July 18, 1890. Finding in Ibsen many ideas that seemed to resemble the theories of the English Socialist Party, Shaw had no hesitation in declaring the Norwegian a Socialist. In the *Daily Chronicle* of August, 1890, there appeared an interview in which Ibsen was represented as angry that Shaw had classed him as a Socialist. But a letter of refutation from Ibsen printed in the *Daily Chronicle* of August 28, 1890, gave his true view of the situation. He said, in part: "Where the correspondent repeats my assertion that I do not belong to the Social-Democratic party, I wish that he had not omitted what I expressly added, namely, that I never have belonged, and probably never shall belong, to any party whatever. I may add here that it has become an absolute necessity to me to work quite independently and to shape my own course. What the correspondent writes about my surprise at seeing my name put forward by Socialistic agitators as that of a supporter of their dogmas is particularly liable to be mis-

understood. What I really said was that I was surprised that I, who had made it my chief life-task to depict human characters and human destinies, should, without conscious or direct intention, have arrived in several matters at the same conclusions as the social-democratic moral philosophers had arrived at by scientific processes."

In the *Fortnightly Review* of July, 1889, in "Ibsen and English Criticism", Archer argued against such a point of view as Shaw's. "A grave injustice has been done Ibsen of late by those of his English admirers who have set him up as a social prophet, and have sometimes omitted to mention that he is a bit of a poet as well. . . . People have heard so much of the 'gospel according to Ibsen' that they have come to think of him as a mere hot-gospeller. As a matter of fact, Ibsen has no gospel whatever, in the sense of a systematic body of doctrine. . . . It belongs to the irony of fate that the least dogmatic of thinkers—the man who has said of himself, 'I only ask: my call is not to answer'—should figure in the imagination of so many English critics as a dour dogmatist. . . . No two life-problems were ever precisely alike, and in stating and solving one, Ibsen does not pretend to supply a ready-made solution for all the rest. He illustrates, or rather illumines, a general principle by a conceivable case; that is all. To treat Nora's arguments in the last scene of 'A Doll's House' as though they were ordered propositions of an essay by John Stuart Mill is to give a striking example of the strange literalness of the English mind, its inability to distinguish between drama and dogma."

This fault of judgment was not confined to Shaw. It

springs from certain characteristics of the typical British mind, and can be found throughout English criticisms, alike in defense of Ibsen and in attacks upon him. In his Christiania speech of May 26, 1898, Ibsen tried to explain his point of view: "Whatever I have written has been without any conscious thought of making propaganda. I have been more poet and less social philosopher than people generally seem inclined to believe. . . . My task has been the description of humanity." But even after Ibsen's definite announcement of his purpose, there still prevailed that attitude that considers Ibsen as a violent propagandist. To this very day, new performances of Ibsen provoke new articles on Ibsen's message, Ibsen's mission, Ibsen's doctrines.

Since the days of "A Doll's House" in 1889, controversial criticism of Ibsen had been more or less under the surface, emerging occasionally in new defences by Archer, new caustic allusions by Scott. But in 1891, in three months there were produced three of Ibsen's greatest controversy-provoking plays, "Rosmersholm", "Ghosts", and "Hedda Gabler", and the fight was on again.

The English periodicals of February, 1891, devoted much of their theatrical columns to the iniquities of "Rosmersholm". While the merely lukewarm reviews dwelt largely on the "provincialism" of the life pictured, the unreality of the political situations discussed, the childlike naïveté of Rosmer's idealism, the absurdity of the double suicide, the more pugnacious reviews seemed most impressed with the nastiness of Rebecca's love for Rosmer. But all agreed that there was little in the play worth the performing. The *Topical Times* declared in disgust:

"There are certain dishes composed of such things as frogs and snails, stews in which oil and garlic reek, and dreadful compounds which we taste out of sheer curiosity, and which, if we expressed our honest, candid opinion, we should pronounce to be nasty and unpleasant. . . . 'Rosmersholm' is beyond me!" The Licensed Victuallers' Gazette concluded that—"If Herr Ibsen were well smothered in mud with his two creations and with every copy of his plays, the world would be all the better for it."

But all this was a mere beginning. In March, 1891, Mr. Grein produced "Ghosts", and the controversy blazed forth in what Archer has termed "a frenzy of execration." Never has English criticism gone through such a month as March, 1891. The press became fairly hysterical and screamed aloud in its rage. The most staid papers lost all sense of decorum and, led by Scott, joined in the contagious orgy of abuse. As Archer has pointed out: "If the play had been a tenth part as nauseous as the epithets hurled at it and its author, the censor's veto would have been justified."

In "Ghosts and Gibberings" in the Pall Mall Gazette of April 8, 1891 (partly reprinted in Shaw's "The Quintessence of Ibsenism") Archer has taken a wicked pleasure in gathering together the most absurd of the criticisms that appeared during this controversy.

For instance, the Sporting and Dramatic News affirmed that "Ninty-seven per cent of the people who go to see 'Ghosts' are nasty-minded people who find the discussion of nasty subjects to their taste in exact proportion to their nastiness." The Evening Standard described all

admirers of "Ghosts" as "lovers of prurience and dabblers in impropriety, who are eager to gratify their illicit tastes under the pretence of art", and elsewhere proposed that the city institute proceedings against the Royalty Theatre under Lord Campbell's act for the suppression of disorderly houses.

Scott, in the Daily Telegraph of March 14, 1891, declared that "realism is one thing; but the nostrils of the audience must not be visibly held before a play can be stamped as true to nature. It is difficult to expose in decorous words the gross and almost putrid indecorum of this play." Probably finding the difficulty impossible to overcome, Scott compared "Ghosts" to "an open drain, a loathsome sore unbandaged, a dirty act done publicly, a lazar house with all its doors and windows open."

This is merely typical of the English criticisms of "Ghosts". Ingenuity was taxed to its utmost, and every foul epithet known was utilized. Ibsen's work was described—to cull a few of the choicest examples—as abominable, poisonous, disgusting, cynical, offensive, scandalous, repulsive, revolting, blasphemous, abhorrent, sordid, hideous, outrageous, indecent, noisome, nasty, foul, garbage, offal, filthy, dirty, degrading, malodorous, loathsome, suggestive, coarse, crapulous, carrion, putrid, fetid, gross, bestial, sickly, delirious, morbid, unhealthy, unwholesome, etc.

The majority of the defenders of Ibsen lost their tempers completely, and answered their opponents hotly and bitterly. A few managed to retain their sense of humor and to give to the demonstration the amused contempt that it deserved. The Athenaeum, in a calm, judicial review on

March 21, summed up the controversy conservatively: "Against 'Ghosts' a series of charges may be sustained. . . . To charge it, however, with immorality is a mistake. It is fiercely moral. Not only is there not in it a passage that can suggest evil—it is one long protest against the employment of euphemisms to describe sordid vice. . . . To those who do not remember the fierce antagonism to which Wagner was exposed, the not undeserved outcry against the nudities of Walt Whitman or the diseased imagination of Baudelaire, the scream against 'Songs and Ballads' and other similar manifestations, it might seem as if decency had been beaten to a mummy and purity had received its death blow. But unless the Lord Chamberlain is coaxed or coerced into interference by those who will afterwards laugh at him, the storm will blow over."

"Hedda Gabler", performed the following month—April, 1891—followed close on the footsteps of "Ghosts", before the critics had had time to recover their serenity, and the controversy was resumed. It was of much the same character as the quarrel over "Ghosts", turning largely on the immorality of Ibsen's "teachings".

Apropos of the publication of "Hedda Gabler" the Theatre exclaimed in horror: "God! What a little world of commonplace puppets glorified in a baleful light! Is this heroine (save the mark!) a keen problem for our wits? Then is every weariful selfish moppet a theme for study! Heartlessness and overweening vanity are no late discoveries, even though drawn by a poet of the new school, and we can read most that we want to know about them in the daily police reports. It is pitiful to see men

of intellect and poets lavishing their best of minutest research on analysis of dung-heaps."

In a delightfully characteristic manner Walkley, in "Playhouse Impressions" refutes his horror-stricken adversaries: "The 'hard-shell' Ibsenites, who insist upon regarding Ibsen as a moralist rather than as a dramatist, will be sore put to it to find the moral of 'Hedda Gabler'. More wary persons, who recognize that the purpose of art is not to point morals, but to create impressions, will be content to accept the play as a picture of a peculiar type of revoltée, a dramatic study of a mental pathology, a nineteenth-century tragedy. A Quarterly reviewer prefers to consider it as an exhibition of 'realism in its most extravagant and possibly its most shameless form.' Such epithets as 'shameless' and 'extravagant' are part of the stock vocabulary of the old judicial school of criticism; but they have absolutely no meaning to those of us who think that literary criticism is not some dominie-business of assigning good and bad marks, but the art of enjoying masterpieces. 'Hedda Gabler' is a masterpiece of piquant subtlety, delicate observation, and tragic intensity, and I take leave to enjoy it. Its heroine may be, as our judicial critic asserts, 'a monstrous specimen of unfettered womanhood'; but I can only ask, 'What then—so long as she is interesting?' She is a very complex, very modern, very morbid type; and if you ask me whether she is to be praised or blamed, I put aside your question as a pure irrelevance—she is to be watched with interest."

A peculiar phase of the Ibsen controversy seems to have first appeared in 1890 or 1891, growing out of Shaw's Ibsen essay, read before the Fabian Society in

1890, and the enlarged essay printed in 1891 as "The Quintessence of Ibsenism". These essays, and Shaw's criticisms of this period, dealt almost exclusively with Ibsen as the teacher and preacher. However, with his characteristic desire to shock, Shaw indicated in them a comparison between Ibsen and Shakespeare, based on dramatic technique, and awarded the palm to the Norwegian.

Such effrontery could not escape unpunished. Without stopping to weigh the possible merits of Shaw's technical comparison, seeing only that he had dared to place Ibsen above Shakespeare, the public rose as a man against the too-smart critic. Shaw defended himself cleverly in the pages of the *Saturday Review*, thoroughly enjoying the lively battle. But opposing critics, pouncing eagerly on certain of Shaw's flippantly exaggerated statements, were able to hold their own, and the controversy finally ended with the odds on the side of the Shakespearians.

The English public never forgot this blow to national pride. It never forgave Shaw's indiscretion in preferring Ibsen to Shakespeare. Huntly Carter, in "New Spirit in Drama and Art" says of Ibsen that he—"was ruined in this country by his English interpreters, who, the more sympathetic they were, the more deadly they became. Ibsen, for instance, has never recovered from Mr. Bernard Shaw's victimization of him. Together with Shakespeare he was butchered to make a Fabian holiday."

It was naturally impossible that critics, engaged in such bitter struggles as those of 1891, could have kept out of the quarrel the personal element. It was but a short road

from an attack on Ibsen to an attack on the Ibsenite. Nor could any critic with real admiration for Ibsen forbear to call to account his maligning adversaries. And so very soon in the controversy the personal point of view crept in. Mr. Charles Dickens, in "The Public's Point of View" in the *Theatre* of November 1, 1894, said of the Ibsen quarrel: "The battle raged for a long time with exceeding fury among the critics and commentators, and more ill-feeling and positive anger were displayed during the fight than I can remember in a long experience of theatrical controversy."

The Wedmore-Herford skirmish mentioned above is a fair example of the type of personal quarrel that developed from Ibsen criticism. A similar critical duel was that in which George Buchanan and Bernard Shaw figured in 1889, in which Buchanan characterized Ibsen as "a Zola with a wooden leg", to which Shaw retorted that Buchanan was a "critic with a wooden head."

To quote M. Filon's discussion of the question in "The English Stage": "It was in the press that the great battles were waged. Many of the critics lost their tempers and their manners, and passed, without realizing it, from ridicule to mere rudeness. . . . Mr. Archer was the target for the fiercest volleys of these battles, in which he commanded the courageous little phalanx of Ibsenites, but he returned shot for shot, and with usury, for his fire was infinitely more destructive than that of his foes." Indeed, Archer figured as protagonist in a majority of these critical duels.

Archer's frequent presence in these personal quarrels was undoubtedly due to his habit of irritating his oppon-

ents by an air of superiority. Archer was a man of broad toleration, but when faced by criticisms as narrow and ignorant as those written by the opponents of "Ghosts", he could not keep out of his retaliations the contempt that he felt. And this contempt always brought forth a storm of personal abuse from his adversaries.

One of Archer's most remarkable articles of this period was "The Free Stage and the New Drama" in the *Fortnightly Review* of November, 1891. Angered by the disgraceful criticisms of "Rosmersholm", "Ghosts", and "Hedda Gabler", Archer sought for an explanation for them, and found it. "When a new poem by Tennyson or Swinburne, a new novel by Mr. Meredith, a new volume by Mr. Morley, makes its appearance, does the editor of this Review apply to me for an appreciation of it? No; he goes to Mr. Pater or Mr. Symonds, Mr. Lang or Mr. Gosse or Mr. Birrell. On purely theatrical subjects I may be allowed a hearing, but who cares a straw about my judgments on non-theatrical literature? And which of my journalistic colleagues can claim any greater authority outside the theatrical sphere? . . . In short, we claim to be specialists, and in a sense we are; but the trouble is that we are specialists in a low sphere, suddenly called upon to do the work of specialists of much higher status and attainments; for it requires at least as much insight and literary and philosophical culture to deal competently with one of Ibsen's plays, as to estimate the technical and intellectual qualities of a poem by Tennyson."

Then, speaking of the French criticisms of "Ghosts": "All felt themselves in the presence of a serious piece of

literature, to be discussed, analyzed, possibly condemned, but certainly not to be spat upon, execrated, and if possible drowned in a whirlpool of noisome epithets. The difference is typical, and the explanation of it is not far to seek. It is simply that the French critics are men of letters, men of acknowledged attainments and competence outside the merely theatrical sphere, while the English critics are more or less experienced, more or less routine-ridden, more or less jaded theatrical journalists The plain truth is that the theatrical journalism of the day is narrow-minded, borné, and if not illiterate, at any rate illiberal in its culture."

As was inevitable, this frank opinion called down on Archer's head a torrent of personal abuse from his fellow critics. He was characterized as a traitor and a renegade. He was ridiculed on all sides for his "higher than thou" attitude. G. W. Dancy struck the popular note when, in an article on "'Literary' Critics" in the Theatre of December 1, 1891, he said that Archer's mental attitude resembled "that of the American schoolmaster, who wrote over his doors:

" 'I'm the head of this here collidge
And what I don't know isn't nollidge.' "

In the following year, in "The Drama in the Dolls-drums", in the Fortnightly Review of August 1, 1892, Archer again expressed opinions that roused the wrath of his fellow critics. This time Archer attacked the English drama, contrasting Pinero's "The Profligate" with "A Doll's House". Though never anything but optimistic concerning the future of English drama, he pointed

out that the drama was in a dangerous position. A contrast of the influence of the Old and New Critics ended with a paragraph on Scott: "Why, Mr. Clement Scott alone has done far more to write down the Scandinavian drama, the Independent Theatre, in short, the whole progressive movement, than all the new critics together have done to write it up. His eloquence is far more copious than theirs, and he addresses, through his three organs, a far wider circle of readers. There must, indeed, be something very much amiss in the cause which, with such an indefatigable ubiquitous Berseck of a champion, fails to conquer all along the line. His weapons, it is true, are a trifle antiquated, but the strength of his arm is prodigious, and he does not mind how or where he hits!"

In the Theatre of October 1, 1892, in an open letter to Archer headed "The Drama in the Doldrums", Scott retaliated by a disgraceful personal attack on his adversary. Archer he called—"A self-elected pedagogue who presumes week after week to lecture his brother journalists, and to assert on his own authority that their brains and intellects are vastly inferior to his own." He cast aspersions on Archer's integrity, by asking if it was wholly sound policy "being a tradesman in Ibsen wares, to head the Ibsen ring?" One of his charges began "With that conspicuous want of taste and absence of journalistic decency for which I fear you are distinguished—". He concluded with: "You will gain more adherents to your anaemic authority if you will condescend occasionally to be accurate—or, shall I politely suggest, abandon that form of undignified equivocation known both as *suggestio falsi* and *suppressio veri*. This will be better for all of

us than the cowardly practice of hamstringing your fellow horses, whilst they endeavor after a toil of thirty-two years to drag—yoked with you—the poor drama up one more heart-breaking hill!" A pathetic figure was Mr. Scott, but a decidedly exasperating one.

This type of personal quarrel naturally increased the bitter feeling between the two parties. The antagonism grew and spread. No longer was Ibsen alone the bone of contention. In almost every theatrical controversy of the period, the Ibsenites were, on the whole, ranged on the radical side, the anti-Ibsenites on the conservative side. When, for instance, in 1893 "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" surprised all England, Scott accused Pinero of indirectly plagiarizing Paul Linden's "Der Schatten". Very naturally it was Archer who took up his old antagonist's gage, and eloquently defended Pinero from the charge.

In 1893, when "The Master Builder" was presented on the stage, the Ibsen controversy broke out afresh. This remarkable play inaugurated a new type of adverse criticism, for it was at this time that the anti-Ibsen journalists relinquished the use of abuse, and adopted that far more dangerous weapon, ridicule.

Unable to understand "the harps in the air", the poetry and romance of "The Master Builder", the critics ridiculed the play and its symbolism. The Athenaeum of February 25, 1893, declared that Ibsen was purposely perplexing in this drama of "malign obscurity." "When 'The Master Builder' is not prurient it seems to be foolish and meaningless. . . . The secret of what the allegory signifies may leak out. We are unconcerned to know it."

The Theatre of April 1, 1893, laughed at the play: "What this extraordinary piece of work may mean, Dr. Ibsen alone can know. Perhaps it is an essay in Brownism, an expression of genius so perfect that everyone may find in it precisely the problem that confronts him, the solution that he seeks. There is room for a score of interpretations: Beware of willing, praying, desiring *anything*—if you have a sickly conscience. If, like Macbeth and Mr. Bumpus, you want to get on, don't let 'I Dare Not' wait upon 'I Would'. Don't kiss a child of thirteen, if you're a married man, or it may end in your death. Is any of these the moral of the play? . . . Presumably there is more in the play than meets the eye. Otherwise it is a very uneven, exasperating, and inconclusive jumble of brilliance and dullness, lucidity and obscurity. But what that particular more is, each must decide for himself."

Every Ibsen critic took a hand at guessing at the meaning of "The Master Builder". Probably the most startling solution was that advanced in all seriousness by the Saturday Review of July 8, 1893, in an article "The Political Master Builder". "The true interpretation of the play so named is, we believe, as yet unascertained. His disciples dispute about it, in fact there are as many meanings as there are disciples. Some people . . . maintain that its sense cannot be discovered because there is no sense to discover. Perhaps we may be allowed to place a conjecture at their disposal. Ibsen has, we believe, paid some attention to the contemporary life of England, including its statesmanship. May he not have designed to symbolize, in the architectural career of Mr.

Halvard Solness, the political career of Mr. Gladstone?" And, point by point, the Saturday Reviewer goes on to prove his quaint theory.

In his preface to "The Master Builder" in the Collected Works, Archer calls attention to the fact that—"The Master Builder" produced a curious double effect. It alienated many of the poet's staunchest admirers, and it powerfully attracted many people who had hitherto been hostile to him." It was "The Master Builder" that, as the Theatre of June 1, 1894, flippantly put it, "set Mr. Damon Archer and Mr. Pythias Walkley by the ears." For in his criticisms of "The Master Builder", Walkley became a temporary apostate.

In "Plays of the Day" in the Fortnightly Review of April 1, 1893, Walkley explained his point of view. He did not like "The Master Builder". He found it full of absurdities, vulgarity, straining after effect. Above all, he did not like symbolism on the stage. He confessed it with humiliation, but he could not overcome his prejudice. Archer defended the play against Walkley's criticisms in "An Appendix for Critics" in the second edition of the play. The Star was for a while the battlefield in which anonymous correspondents fought their erstwhile beloved "Spectator" for his sudden desertion of the cause.

Walkley's lead was followed by Justin McCarthy, who criticised "The Master Builder" severely in the pages of the Gentleman's Magazine. "A Doll's House" and "Hedda Gabler" he considered masterpieces, but he could not place this latest play in their class. "Ibsen is a great man; he is the greatest dramatist of his age; but a great man can blunder, and this great man has blundered!"

The tactics of ridicule, found so efficacious in the case of "The Master Builder", were again employed in 1894 when "The Wild Duck" was first presented in England. The Athenaeum of May 12 declared that—"The play must be a joke, a harmless, if not very humorous, piece of self-banter, or it is nothing. The only meaning we can read into it is that the author seeks to supply a *reductio ad absurdum* of the views with which he has been credited by his disciples. . . . The sustained orgy in which these and other characters take part is, we are told, a true picture of Norwegian life. We are sorry to hear this, and loath to believe it."

In a thoughtful article on "The Humour of 'The Wild Duck'" in St. Paul's Magazine of May 29, 1897, Archer protested against that type of criticism used by anti-Ibsenites that deliberately tried to misinterpret the plays. Hjalmar is a comic character. And yet the Daily Telegraph tried to pretend otherwise: "Why was it that an outburst of irreverent laughter unduly disturbed the reverential attitude of the Ibsenites? But so it was, and as ill luck would have it, the Master laid himself out all the afternoon for ribald jests. . . . No one was able to decide if 'The Wild Duck' is the very funniest play ever written, or a desperately serious problem. Has Ibsen any sense of humour at all, or is he the funniest fellow who ever put pen to paper? Is he poking fun at us all as is done in the most brilliant fashion by his very cleverest supporter? For our own part, since Mr. W. S. Gilbert wrote 'Engaged' and 'Tom Cobb', no play was ever written so exquisitely ludicrous as 'The Wild Duck'. We shrewdly suspect that Mr. Laurence Irving shares our

opinion, for he played Hjalmar Ekdal, the sublime egoist, so magnificently that the house pealed with laughter." Archer pointed out the subtlety of these tactics of trying to persuade an audience that it is laughing at Ibsen instead of with Ibsen. He ended: "I would beg playgoers to take heart of grace and believe that when Ibsen draws a comic character he intends him to be laughed at." Truly the anti-Ibsenites were beginning to substitute rapiers for bludgeons!

"Degeneration", translated from Dr. Max Nordau's "Entartung", appeared in England in 1895 and ran through five editions in its first year. This popular book appealed to the reactionary element, wearied of the rhapsodic ecstasies of the extreme Ibsenites and Wagnerites. Nordau's book was built on the sound hypothesis that the strain of modern life produces nervous diseases, and on the false hypothesis that the modern man of genius is a type of this degeneration. Particularly unhappy was Dr. Nordau's selection of his degenerates, including, as he did, Wagner, Tolstoi, Ibsen, the Pre-Raphaelites, the Impressionists.

The chapter on Ibsen started with an admission of Ibsen's poetic power, ability to depict emotions, effective technique, and gift of drawing minor characters "possessing a truth to life and a completeness such as are not to be met with in any poet since Shakespeare."

Then came the attempt to prove Ibsen a degenerate in spite of these excellencies. Proof No. 1: Ibsen is not truly realistic. For instance, no woman now-a-days would be so shortsighted as to leave an asylum uninsured against fire, no matter how conventional she might be; nor would

any professorship depend on the writing of a book, as did that for which Lövborg and Tesman struggled, etc., etc., etc. Proof No. 2: Ibsen is not scientific. The discussions on medicine in "An Enemy of the People", "A Doll's House", "Ghosts", etc. are incorrect, as is also Ibsen's idea of heredity. Proof No. 3: Ibsen is not a modern, but an orthodox Christian, upholding the doctrines of original sin, confession, sacrifice, etc. Proof No. 4: Ibsen continually contradicts himself. Mrs. Alving and Thea are praised for wanting free love, Alving and Werle condemned. Nora and Stockmann should be egoists, but Torvald and Bernick are ruined because of their egoism. Lona and Stockmann must tell the truth, but in the hands of Gregers Werle the truth becomes fatal. Above all, Ibsen does not know his own ideas on marriage, and can not decide whether or not a true marriage is possible. Proof No. 5: Ibsen is full of phrases taken from popular orators. Proof No. 6: In "Brand", with its "all or nothing" doctrine, Ibsen shows himself deranged. Proof No. 7: Ibsen repeats senseless phrases, as "the crutch is floating", "fancy that!" etc., thus proving himself a victim of Echolalia. Proof No. 8: Ibsen indulges in a mad use of symbolism, as "in making the weather gloomy during the action of the tragedy."

For these reasons, Dr. Nordau declared Ibsen a mystic degenerate and an egomaniac. His effort "sinks below the level of the human." His characters are "drunkards", "silly louts", "idiots", "crazed hysterical geese". "And this malignant anti-social simpleton, highly gifted, it must be admitted, in the technique of the stage, they

have had the audacity to try to raise upon the shield as the great world-poet of the closing century."

An anonymous book, "Regeneration", appeared shortly after the publication of Nordau's scientific study, and attempted to answer its charges. Fifty pages were devoted to Ibsen.

A more capable refutation, however, appeared in 1895, in an article by Shaw in an American paper, *Liberty*, and reprinted in book form in 1908. Shaw headed his rebuttal: "The Sanity of Art; An Exposure of the Current Nonsense about Artists being Degenerate." Shaw had no difficulty in showing up the patent absurdities of Nordau's pseudo-scientific arguments, and came out decidedly the victor.

As early as 1891 there were rumors that Ibsen expected to visit London. The *Athenaeum* of May 23, 1891, denied the truth of the report, and advised Ibsen "to avoid the inhospitable land where 'the guardians of dramatic literature' in comic terror call for the enforcement of the censure and the interference of the police."

In 1895 Archer judged that the time was ripe for Ibsen's visit to England. The worst of the Ibsen controversy was over. In spite of his enemies, Ibsen had won lasting recognition in England. Ibsen's friends could now be counted by the hundreds, instead of numbering two, as in 1880. And so Archer wrote to the dramatist, urging him to visit the land that had at length become fairly friendly to him.

In a letter dated Christiania, June 27, 1895, Ibsen replied: "I regret ever more and more that I neglected at the proper time to learn to speak English. Now it is too

late. Were I conversant with the language, I should go to London at once, or, to be more correct, I should have been there long ago." A letter to Brandes, dated April 24, 1896, says: "In your last letter you make the suggestion that I should visit London. If I knew enough English I might perhaps go. But as I unfortunately do not, I must give up the idea altogether." And so Ibsen never saw that country in which he had been abused more violently than in any other land, except perhaps his own; and in which he had found some of his staunchest friends and supporters.

With the performance of "Little Eyolf" in 1896, the Ibsen controversy blazed up for the last time. This play was as cordially hated as ever "Ghosts" had been, but conditions had changed. Ibsen was now a recognized world-dramatist, and critics no longer felt it needful to deluge him with vile epithets. It was rather with regret and sadness that they felt compelled to disapprove of "Little Eyolf".

A typical criticism is the one by A. F. Spender in the Dublin Review of January, 1897. Spender heads his article "Little Eyolf, a Plea for Reticence". He criticised the dramatist for concentrating all the action in Act I, for introducing a symbolic character in a realistic drama, and, above all, for want of reticence. Several times Spender referred to passages "which, for obvious reasons, we refrain from quoting." He said in part: "It is just because Ibsen possesses so much genius that one deplores that he should pander to the modern craving for what is morbid and unwholesome. . . . He is like a surgeon, scalpel in hand, in his dissecting room. Only he dissects

souls, not bodies." Of the "champagne" scene he declared that "no scene in any one of the old dramatists equals this for suggestive indecency." This is the same type of criticism as that which assailed "Ghosts" in 1891, yet there is a very perceptible difference in the attitude towards the scarcely known Norwegian and the attitude towards the acknowledged master of European drama.

On Ibsen's seventieth birthday, March 20, 1898, the aged poet received tributes from every country that knew his dramas. On the continent the event was celebrated by special representations of his works. Though the English theatre took no notice of the day, a small group of Ibsen lovers, including Archer, Shaw, Asquith, Barrie, Hardy, Jones, Pinero, Gosse, etc., sent the dramatist a large silver goblet which was given a place of honor in his home.

Eight years later Ibsen died, and the English journals were flooded with extravagant eulogy and fulsome praise. There were few, if any, dissenting voices. Even those who disliked his plays admitted his genius. All England united with the remainder of the civilized world in bringing tribute to the best hated artist of his generation.

The outcry against the plays of Ibsen was an unconscious acknowledgment of their merit and his genius. Poor plays are merely wearisome. But a play that can inspire glowing admiration and passionate dislike, a play that can create discussion for a month or more, that surely is a great play.

The Ibsen controversy was not entirely an admirable one. Reason gave way constantly to ill-temper, and the issues were often clouded. Ibsen was misinterpreted on

all sides. The anti-Ibsenites, prejudiced, narrow, and lacking in self-control, insisted on emphasizing the "immorality" of the dramas. Even the Ibsenites were occasionally incorrect in their estimates of their master. Of course one cannot take too seriously the faddist Ibsenites, with their "large majority of hot-gospellers, professional eccentrics, ratés, intellectual déclassés, spinsters who take up Ibsen as an alternative to 'art needlework' or the worship of Jumbo" (to quote the irrepressible Mr. Walkley). But even the most capable of Ibsen's defenders occasionally fell into error. For instance, Boyesen, one of his keenest interpreters in America, at times totally misunderstood Ibsen, as when he said of Nora: "In her desperate strait, having no time to lose, she tries the same questionable arts on Dr. Rank, which so often had brought her husband to her feet; and the doctor, being a man of few scruples, promptly responds with a declaration of love. In utter disgust, Nora turns from him, without having breathed the momentous question." And Shaw, one of Ibsen's most brilliant advocates in England, constantly overemphasized the propagandist in the poet.

Archer attempts to explain the misunderstandings of which Ibsen was victim, by calling attention to the fact that the dramatist was known to his critics solely through the medium of translations. In the *Critic* of July, 1906, Archer said: "What should we think of a man who, knowing no French, should sit down to write a critical study of Victor Hugo? or who, knowing no German, should take upon himself to weigh Goethe in the balance and find him wanting? Yet this is inevitably the position

of nineteen out of twenty critics who deal with the works of Ibsen."

This undoubtedly contributed to the errors in Ibsen criticism, but does not wholly explain them. Ibsen, who requires careful study, was read quickly and criticised in passionate haste. He was deliberately misinterpreted by critics who wished to strengthen certain of their theories. And other critics, blinded by hatred of certain of Ibsen's ideas, were unable to see the poet in true perspective.

All in all, however, the controversy was decidedly worth while. It was as wholesome as a brisk storm-wind. It awakened tired critics and jaded playgoers. It sharpened wits and compelled everyone to form an opinion, for neutrality was impossible. And, above all, it made Ibsen known throughout the English speaking world as nothing else could have done.

III.

ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF IBSEN*

THE eighteen seventies saw only a few English translations of Ibsen, and no translations of any very great merit or any decided importance. By far the best work was done by Ibsen's sponsor, Gosse, whose translations of several lyrics and passages from the poetic dramas show his usual metrical perfection and delicacy of touch. The Ibsen translations in the Bergen edition "Norwegian and Swedish Poems" and in the English volume "Translations from the Norse" are mediocre and lacking in any definite poetic quality. Miss Ray's "Emperor and Galilean" is a faithful piece of work, but is pale and colorless.

It was not until 1888 that Ibsen appeared in an adequate English translation. But the early eighteen eighties are not to be disregarded, for here we find the first English "A Doll's House" and the first English "Ghosts".

"Et dukkehjem", the play that was to become Ibsen's most popular drama in England, was first translated into English in 1880 by T. Weber, and was published by him in Copenhagen. Mr. Weber was a Danish schoolmaster, the author of many learned glossaries, phrase books and grammars. His acquaintance with the English language, however, was limited to the possession of a Danish-English dictionary. As a result of this purely theoretical knowledge of English, his "Nora" is full of the most de-

*See Appendix A.

licious absurdities. It is probably fortunate for Ibsen that very few copies of "Nora" were sold; and yet what a rich store of humor has been lost because of the inaccessibility of this little book!

William Archer seems to be one of the few Englishmen who possess a copy of "Nora". In an article in Volume I of "Time," he printed under the title "Ibsen as he is Translated" some of the most joyous bits of dialogue. For instance, Mrs. Linde asks Nora:

"And your husband returned completely cured?"

NORA: "Sound as a roach! . . . And our children are well and healthy like I am. (*Starts up applauding*) Oh dear! Oh dear! Kristine it is, indeed, excessively charming to live and be happy!"

Dr. Rank asks Mrs. Linde:

"Then you have come to town in order to recreate during all banquets?"

Poor Nora, after Krogstad leaves her, exclaims:

"Deprave my little children? Poison my home? (*A short pause; she turns up her nose*) This is not true. This is in the name of wonder not true."

Mrs. Linde tells Krogstad:

"But now I'm alone in the world, so excessively inane and abandoned."

The great final scene is particularly mutilated. Helmer says:

"Don't utter such stupid shuffles: . . . Doff the shawl! . . . From this moment it depends no longer on felicity; it depends only on saving the rests, remnants and the appearance."

.

HELMER: "You are first of all a wife and mother."

NORA: ". . . I believe that I am first of all a man, I as well as you—or, at all events, that I am to try to become a man."

NORA: "As I am now, I am no wife for you."

HELMER: "I have power to grow another."

HELMER: "Change yourself in such a manner that—?"

NORA: "That cohabitation between you and me might become a matrimony. Good-bye (*exit through the corridor.*)"

Never was the most rabid anti-Ibsenite quite as facetious at Ibsen's expense as was the estimable Mr. Weber.

The first Ibsen translation that gained any degree of popularity in England as a reading play, was another version of "A Doll's House." Henrietta Frances Lord's "Nora" was published in 1882, and instantly gained sufficient popularity to warrant second and third editions. Dull and uninspired as is this translation, there yet shone through it some of the greatness of Ibsen's dramatic art.

Archer has described Miss Lord's translation as "a conscientious piece of work, but heavy and not always accurate." Heavy the translation certainly is, and full of awkward circumlocutions.

HELMER: "Nora, can I never become to you anything but a stranger?" . . .

NORA: "We both should need to change so, you as well

as I, that—O, Torvald, I no longer believe in anything miraculous.”

HELMER: “But I believe in it. Tell me. We must so change that—”

NORA: “That our living together could be a marriage. Goodbye.” (*She goes out through the hall.*)

HELMER: (*Sinks in a chair by the door with his hands before his face*) “Nora! Nora! (*He looks round and stands up.*) Empty! She is not here now. (*A hope inspires him.*) The greatest miracle!” (*Below stairs a door is heard shutting ominously in the lock.*)

Miss Lord's preface to her translation is peculiarly interesting. Here, in the first volume of Ibsen that gained an English audience of any considerable size, the dramatist is introduced as a propagandist. Ibsen is famous through Europe, Miss Lord declares, as the “Woman's Poet”, the bold champion of Woman's Rights. For the benefit of those ladies who might be interested in a personal description of their knight, Miss Lord dilates on his “long grey hair and whiskers”, his “Jupiter's brow”, his “delicate mouth”, and self-command that “is but the snow that covers a volcano of wild and passionate power.” Ibsen, she says, “opens all the great gates of his poetry to noble, pure-hearted, loving, disappointed women, who move about among reckless men as the natural centers for conversion and reconciliation, but either lack courage to seize the occasion, or, if they have much courage, happen to have such a pig-headed, one-sided manhood to deal with, that the inspired woman, the heavenly herald of nature and conscience, is trampled under foot or passed by, the man regretting it, but when it is too late. Such are

most of Ibsen's women . . . his task is to release the Sleeping Beauty, as the prince did in our childish fable. . . . Ibsen approaches the thorn-girt home; he knows that every expression crushes thousands of conventionality's roses; and on his plain but trusty sword are these words only—Love and Understand."

This amazing picture of Ibsen as a squire of distressed dames is unique in critical literature; but, in stressing the propagandist in Ibsen, Miss Lord was but the pioneer and fore-runner of a host of later English critics headed by no less a personage than Bernard Shaw, whose Ibsen is always the propagandist.

The success of "Nora" led Miss Lord to turn to "Gengangere", which she translated and published as "Ghosts" in 1885 in a socialistic journal, *To-day*, and later revised and printed in book form in 1888. This was the first English version of the play. The translation is a decided improvement over Miss Lord's "Nora". There is the same ponderous style, but there are fewer awkward un-English constructions. Strangely enough, "Ghosts", everywhere provocative of the bitterest controversy, here made no sensation.

Miss Lord's 1888 volume of "Ghosts" is notable for an astounding preface, in which the translator gravely explains "Ghosts" from the point of view of a philosophy known as "Karma". This preface is delightfully amusing because of the solemn absurdities of Miss Lord's doctrines; but to lovers of Ibsen, his appearance in such guise must have been distressingly irritating.

Miss Lord said in part: "Stating my philosophy of the play, I would say that part of our sense of pain and dis-

order arises from so many of the characters having travestied their sex; Chamberlain Alving was really a woman-soul, Mrs. Alving a man-soul; Mr. Manders is a woman; so is Oswald; Regina is a man. . . . Some souls perform all their evolutions, sub-human and human, attached to and acting through bodies of one sex; sometimes their own; sometimes the opposite; some adopt change for selfish, some for noble reasons, education, mission, etc., Ibsen himself being a woman-soul who has taken man's form for his work's sake. . . . Mr. Manders took man's form for power; he had been a conventional woman in a former life, and now wished the self-importance of being a male ecclesiastic. Regina took woman's form to mitigate the impact of blows in life . . . she had been a very bad man, and had nothing but blows to expect from Karma. . . . Alving had been obsessed by sensual tempters all his life . . . after death they made Mr. Alving attach himself to his unhappy son, and studied how to darken his mind. . . . Then if heredity does not account for Oswald's suffering, how came he to be the child of his parents? . . . Mrs. Alving owed Oswald something; it would be paid by her incarnating as a woman and being his mother. Had he been more evolved, he might have shrunk from accepting a favor from a soul like Mr. Alving's, even though he had a claim on Mrs. Alving. Oswald either did not perceive, or accepted the risk of having a bad man for a father. This element of weakness in Oswald explains his falling a victim to that father in the way I have described. . . . The unwholesomeness of 'Ghosts' consists of its mis-presenting all these transitory

phases of soul history and calling them the operation of the law of Heredity. The disorder consists in the travesty of sex. . . . It is useless to invite people to see that Oswald's dead father frightened him into idiocy, unless we are also able to show how his mother could have prevented that injury had she known how to go to work."¹ And in Footnote 1 Miss Lord explains "The method is fully described in 'Christian Science Healing' by Frances Lord." This is the guise in which Ibsen's most solemn and most terrible tragedy first appeared in England.

In this same year the first Archer translation appeared and with it better days for Ibsen in England.

William Archer had Norwegian relatives, among them an uncle, Colin Archer, a renowned builder of boats in Larvik. For many years Archer had spent his summers with his Norwegian kinsfolk, and in this way had come to learn the Norwegian language. Once acquainted with the language, it was inevitable that he should turn to Norwegian literature, and here he discovered Ibsen.

Always a devotee of literature Archer gave up the law in 1875 and entered journalism. After a year spent in Australia, he returned to London in 1878 and became a dramatic critic. Though he had been a warm admirer of Ibsen for several years, he did not take active part in the Ibsen campaign until 1880. In that year, he was instrumental in the performance of "Samfundets stotter" ("Pillars of Society") in a translation that he himself had prepared.

Archer first met Ibsen in Rome in 1881. Inspired by the artist, fascinated by the man, he returned to England

determined to continue the campaign for the popularization of Ibsen in England. Here he achieved notable success in his keen defenses and sympathetic criticisms of the dramatist.

Valuable as are his criticisms of Ibsen and his share in the Ibsen controversy, Archer's greatest service has probably been his translation of the dramas. The first of these published translations appeared in 1888 in the volume "Pillars of Society and Other Plays", published by Walter Scott in the Camelot Series. This volume contained an illuminating introduction by Havelock Ellis, the editor, Archer's translation of "Pillars of Society", revised from his 1880 version, "Ghosts" revised by Archer from Miss Lord's translation, and "An Enemy of Society", translated from "En folkefiende" by Mrs. Eleanor Marx-Aveling.

This volume gained instantaneous success. All three of the translations were recognized as achievements far in advance of any Ibsen translations that had preceded them. At times a bit stiff and lacking in flexibility, the style still had a rugged strength and simplicity that accorded well with these three plays. Ellis's preface evidenced strong sympathy with Ibsen and a fine literary sense. With unerring judgment he called attention to those qualities of Ibsen most calculated to win and hold an audience. In less than five years the publishers sold over fourteen thousand copies of this volume. To most of these readers, on both sides of the Atlantic, this volume afforded their first view of Ibsen. It is indeed the first English translation of Ibsen that gained for the Norwegian any adequate recognition.

Archer followed these translations with a limited edition of "A Doll's House", published to commemorate the Novelty Theatre production of 1889. These translations called forth from Ibsen the letter of Munich, November 3, 1889, in which he wrote to Archer: "I shall always feel that I owe you a great debt of gratitude for all that you have done, and are still doing, to introduce my works into England."

There followed a translation of "Rosmersholm" by Louis Napoleon Parker—full of peculiarly un-English idioms, but effective in its reproduction of the spirit of the original—and Mrs. Marx-Aveling's translation of "Fruen fra havet" as "The Lady from the Sea".

Some months had elapsed since Ibsen first gained an English audience with the volume "Pillars of Society and Other Plays". Ibsen's popularity was growing rapidly. His circle of readers eagerly pored over the seven plays that had appeared in scattered English editions, and demanded to know what else Ibsen had written. The time seemed ripe for a collected edition of the dramas.

On November 3, 1889, the Athenaeum announced: "By arrangement with Henrik Ibsen, Mr. Walter Scott will publish a complete edition of Ibsen's prose plays, historical as well as social. . . . Mr. William Archer has undertaken to translate several of the plays, and will be responsible for the accuracy of the whole series."

This first collection of Ibsen's plays, "Ibsen's Prose Dramas," appeared in five volumes in 1890 and 1891. It contained the first English translations of "De unges forbund" ("The League of Youth"), "Haermaendene paa Helgeland" ("Vikings at Helgeland"), "Kongs-emnerne"

("The Pretenders"), and "Hedda Gabler", all by William Archer; the first translations of "Vildanden" ("The Wild Duck"), by Mrs. F. E. Archer, and "Fru Inger til Ostraat" ("Lady Inger of Ostrat"), by Charles Archer; and translations of "Pillars of Society", "A Doll's House", "Ghosts", "An Enemy of the People", "Emperor and Galilean", "Rosmersholm", and "The Lady from the Sea." The translations in this collection are uniformly good. They are idiomatic and accurate, and show traces of the careful editing of William Archer.

In the same two years, there was published in New York and London "The Prose Dramas of Henrik Ibsen", a three volume collection, edited by Gosse. Here there are only the nine social dramas that had been written up to that time. On the whole, the translations are slightly inferior to those in the larger collection, several of the plays particularly lacking forcefulness of style.

These two collections of Ibsen published during the same two years, evidence the popularity of Ibsen's dramas as reading plays in the early nineties. Ibsen's position was now firmly established, and each new play that he wrote was speedily rushed into English translation and hastily handed over to an eager audience.

Up to 1891 there had been no attempt to translate in its entirety any one of Ibsen's dramas in verse. In an article in the Theatre of April 11, 1884, Archer had explained the lack of a translation of Ibsen's "Brand"—"the difficulties presented by his strong local colour and rich versification being probably insuperable." In 1891, William Wilson compromised with the difficulties by publishing a prose version of "Brand" in which the almost

literal translation was unhampered by any metrical demands. The prose is dull and mechanical, and gives no idea of the vividness of the galloping meter in the Norwegian. And yet the volume was decidedly popular, and was later reprinted.

The second of Ibsen's dramatic poems to find a complete English version was "Peer Gynt", translated by William and Charles Archer. The translators rejected the prose method of William Wilson, believing that "the characteristic quality of the poet's achievement lay precisely in his having, by the aid of rhythm and rhyme, transfigured the most easy and natural dialogue, without the least sacrifice of its naturalness", and prose, of course, could never reproduce this effect. But the very elaborate rhyme scheme of Ibsen's poem they were also forced to reject. The double and triple rhymes so trippingly employed by Ibsen give to the play "a metrical character which it might puzzle Mr. Swinburne to reproduce in English." Moreover, the use of elaborate rhymes would have necessitated padding and inversion of phrase that would have destroyed the characteristic vernacular ease and simplicity of Ibsen's style. And so the translators determined to retain the meters of "Peer Gynt", but to employ unrhymed verse.

Mr. William Archer has explained the purpose of the translation: "We sought to produce a translation which should convey to the general reader some faint conception of the movement and colour, the wit and pathos, of the original and at the same time a transcript which should serve the student as a 'crib' to the Norwegian text. . . . The following version is designed to facilitate, not to

supersede, the study of the original. . . . Our fundamental principle, then, has been to represent the original *line for line*."

This method of translating "Peer Gynt" is by no means the ideal one. Put "Don Juan" into blank verse, and the resulting poem, like the Archer "Peer Gynt", will be robbed of half its humor. Moreover, the line for line method has been a hampering one. But, on the whole, this translation satisfactorily interprets the spirit of the poem, and is a creditable performance of a uniquely difficult task.

Some years later, in 1913, R. Ellis Roberts published a translation of "Peer Gynt" in the original rhymes. His translation is a pleasant one, but is utterly lacking in vigor and spirit.

The year 1894 saw three translations of "Brand". William Wilson's prose version appeared in a second edition, and there were issued two new translations, "Brand, in English Verse in the Original Meters" by F. Edmund Garrett, and "Brand" by Professor Charles Harold Herford.

The two metrical translations of course superseded Wilson's imperfect prose play. Garrett uses the original rhythm and rhymes. The version is often inaccurate and imperfect, as the translator had only a limited knowledge of Norwegian. But the English poem is noble and spirited. The song of Einar and Agnes especially is most beautifully rendered. On the whole, the translation is an admirably sympathetic one.

Herford's translation is more nearly perfect than Garrett's. It is remarkably accurate. Like Garrett, Profes-

sor Herford reproduced the meters of the original, but he allowed himself less license, clinging to the line for line method of translation. His version, therefore, has not quite the free swing of Garrett's.

On the whole, both Herford's and Garrett's translations are admirable pieces of work, reproducing satisfactorily the meter, the diction, and the spirit of the original, without sacrificing the beauty of the English poem.

During the last eight years of his creative life, Ibsen's four last plays appeared almost simultaneously in Norway and England. "Bygmester Solness" was written in 1892. Almost immediately, there was published in England a Norwegian edition, followed a few months later by an English translation, "The Master Builder", by Gosse and Archer. Archer's translations of "Little Eyolf" in 1895 and "John Gabriel Borkman" in 1897 followed immediately the Norwegian publications. Ibsen's last play, "Naar vi doede vaagner" was translated by Archer as "When We Dead Awaken" in 1900, very shortly after the original play was issued.

In 1900, Professor Herford followed his successful "Brand" with an English translation of "Kaerlighendens komedie" ("Love's Comedy.") He reproduced with masterly skill the original meters, gaining a light lilting effect very like the impression left by Ibsen's scurrying lines.

With Ibsen's three most important poetic dramas in adequate English dress, the lyrics next claimed the attention of translators. The English public had had the opportunity of reading several of these short poems, as

translations had appeared in periodicals and in various commentaries on Ibsen. But it remained for R. A. Streatfield to gather together and translate Ibsen's best lyrics and publish them in 1902 as "Ibsen's Lyrical Poems." This volume contains many poems that had never before being translated into English, and has moreover the merit of presenting Ibsen's finest lyrics within a single volume. Streatfield's translations are charming.

In 1905 there appeared in England an interesting and highly valuable volume of "Ibsen's Letters", translated by John Nilsen Laurvik and Mary Morrison. Unfortunately Ibsen never preserved his correspondence, and so we have here merely the letters that he himself wrote. The editors, however, strove to remedy this defect by giving in copious footnotes the substance, at least in part, of those letters to Ibsen that called forth his answers. The letters are fairly well translated, and furnish indispensable side-lights on Ibsen's character and personality.

"Speeches and New Letters of Ibsen," translated by Arne Kildal, a volume originally published in the United States in 1909, was printed in England in 1911. This book furnishes a valuable supplement to the material in the earlier volume.

The great English edition of Ibsen is "The Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen" published by Heinemann, and edited by Archer. This is the first really systematic survey of Ibsen's work that has appeared in England. Several volumes were issued in 1906, the year of the dramatist's death. The rest followed in 1907 and 1908. This splendid edition is in eleven volumes, and contains all of Ibsen's collected works except "Catilina". Mr. Archer

apologizes in the preface for his omission of this play: "A great part of its interest lies in the very crudities of its style, which it would be a thankless task to reproduce in translation. Moreover, the poet impaired even its biographical value by largely rewriting it before its republication. He did not make it, nor attempt to make it, a better play, but he in some measure corrected its juvenility of expression. Which version, then, should a translator choose? To go back to the original would seem a deliberate disregard of the poet's wishes; while, on the other hand, the retouched version is clearly of far inferior interest. It seemed advisable, therefore, to leave the play alone, so far as this edition was concerned."

All of Ibsen's plays hitherto translated into English appear in this collection. In addition there is the early play "Gildet paa Solhoug". Charles Archer translated "Lady Inger of Ostrat" and "Rosmersholm", Herford translated "Love's Comedy" and "Brand", Mrs. Marx-Aveling translated "An Enemy of the People", Mrs. F. E. Archer translated "The Wild Duck" and "The Lady from the Sea", Charles and William Archer translated "Peer Gynt", Gosse and William Archer translated "Hedda Gabler" and "The Master Builder", and William Archer translated the remaining ten plays.

"From Ibsen's Workshop", a volume containing notes, scenarios, and drafts of Ibsen's social dramas, has been printed as Volume 12 of this edition. It is particularly valuable as an indication of Ibsen's creative method. Gosse's "Ibsen", a well written biography of the dramatist, has been added to "The Collected Works" as Volume 13.

"The Collected Works" was immediately recognized as the fullest and most capably edited edition of Ibsen's dramas. So great was the demand for these books that six volumes were reissued in April, 1907. The collection has been reprinted again and again in England and America and will undoubtedly remain for many years the standard English edition of Ibsen.

For some years FydeU Edmund Garrett had been publishing in various periodicals his translations of Ibsen's verse. In 1912, after her husband's death, Mrs. Garrett collected these translations and arranged them for publication. In addition to twenty-six short lyrics, "Lyrics and Poems from Ibsen" contains the two long poems "Paa Vidderne" ("On the Heights") and "Terje Vigen", songs from "The Feast at Solhoug", "Love's Comedy", "The Pretenders", and "Peer Gynt", Ase's death scene from "Peer Gynt", and a revised version of "Brand". The translations in this volume are at times a bit inaccurate, but the spirit of the originals is there and the English verse is exquisite.

Editions and re-editions of Ibsen's plays have continued well into 1915, when the war put a stop to all such publications. Ibsen's plays in English have shown an astounding vitality. In the last thirty years there have appeared some seventy-five English editions of Ibsen's plays, some containing a single play, some containing twenty-one plays. There have been shilling editions and limited editions de luxe, elaborate and costly. And the market for Ibsen's plays is still an active one.

The task of translating Ibsen's dramas into English has not been an easy one. The plays in verse present insuper-

able difficulties because of Ibsen's elaborate metrical devices, which should be reproduced, since in every case they are keyed to the spirit of the poem, but which often can be reproduced in form only at the expense of a fairly literal translation. But Ibsen's prose plays, too, present difficulties. In the General Preface to the Collected Works, Archer says: "Ibsen is at once extremely easy and extremely difficult to translate. It is extremely easy, in his prose plays, to realize his meaning; it is often extremely difficult to convey it in natural, colloquial, and yet not too colloquial English. He is especially fond of laying barbed-wire entanglements for the translator's feet, in the shape of recurrent phrases for which it is absolutely impossible to find an equivalent that will fit in all the different contexts. But this is only one of the many classes of obstacles which encountered us on almost every page."

But despite its difficulties, the work has been done and has been well done. Every Ibsen play, except "Catilina" and the early plays omitted from his Collected Works by Ibsen himself, has been translated at least once, and some of the plays have appeared in as many as fifteen or twenty editions. Many enthusiastic men and women have devoted their time and their energy to this work. One of these, William Archer, is able to say of his work as an editor, critic, and translator of Ibsen, that it has been "one of the chief labours, as it has certainly been one of the greatest privileges of my life. Since 1887 or thereabouts, not many months have passed in which a considerable portion of my time has not been devoted to acting, in one

form or another, as intermediary between Ibsen and the English-speaking public."

The greater part of the English translations of Ibsen are by Archer. Many of the plays signed by names other than his, have passed through his careful editing. The quality of Archer's translations is uniformly high. They are absolutely accurate. They interpret remarkably well the spirit of Ibsen's plays. Their style is strong and simple, well suited to the subject matter with which they deal. But there is one great fault that characterizes practically all of the English translations of Ibsen. We miss the poetry, the fire of the Norwegian. Ibsen continually calls himself a poet; his countrymen term him Norway's greatest poet. Yet where can we find a trace of poetry in the bald, colorless prose of our English translations? The poetry often gleams through even the social dramas, in the dark background and the vivid sunrise of "Ghosts", in the White Horses of Rosmersholm, in the tumbling green waters that Ellida loves, in the sound of the harps in the air, yet even here these richly poetic figures are couched in baldly prosaic language. The fault is not Archer's. Ibsen was a poet, Archer is not—there is the difficulty. But even if Archer were a poet, the difficulty might still be insuperable. Gosse is a poet, yet his "Hedda Gabler" is no more beautiful than Archer's. The truth probably is that the poetic quality of Ibsen's prose is something too subtle to be carried over in a translation. Ibsen's stories we can get, his people live for us, his ideas come over in their full force, but his strong, quiet, yet vivid style we cannot get in English.

Though the poetry is inevitably missing, Archer's trans-

lations are of a high order. Of his associate's work, Edmund Gosse has said: "I have little hesitation in saying that no other foreign author of the second half of the nineteenth century has been so ably and exhaustively edited in England as Ibsen has been in this instance." The Italian critic, Mario Borsa, in "The English Stage of To-Day" asserts that "the translations in verse and prose by William Archer are—in the opinions of the Norwegians themselves—the most accurate, effective, animated, elegant, as well as the most passionate to be found in any European language."

These translations of Ibsen have won their definite place in the reading matter of the English-speaking world. Ibsen has become an English classic.

IV.

PERFORMANCES OF IBSEN IN ENGLAND*

IT WAS in December, 1880, that an Ibsen play first found its way to the London stage. Impressed by its dramatic qualities, Archer had translated "Pillars of Society" in 1877, a few weeks after its first appearance in Norway. In vain he had peddled his translation in the English market. Publisher after publisher, he frankly tells us, had refused to print the play, failing to find in it any particular merit. Indeed "Pillars of Society" did not appear in print until 1888. But in the meantime Archer was not content to let the matter drop. He prepared an adaptation of the play, as "Quicksands, or The Pillars of Society", for stage presentation, and arranged for its performance at a single matinee on Wednesday morning, December 15, 1880, at the Gaiety Theatre.

The Athenaeum which had heralded the performance as "the means of introducing to the English public a prominent and an original poet",¹ praised the production highly. "As a dramatic satire, the 'Pillars of Society' of Ibsen is worthy of the reputation of its author. With a relentless vigour—which accounts for Ibsen's unpopularity among his own countrymen—the most familiar vices of modern society are scourged and lashed. . . . With the satire is connected a good and telling story,

*See Appendix B.

¹Athenaeum, December 24, 1880.

punishment she has incurred she is saved by her husband, who takes on himself the burden of guilt. By a clumsy expedient the husband is himself saved, and the current of domestic serenity once more runs under conditions that recall the life of Charlotte and her spouse, as defined by Thackeray's clever satire. There is, indeed, nothing for the heroine to do but to go on 'cutting bread and butter', decking Christmas trees, or occupying herself with other similar pursuits."

It was probably to combat such views as this, that Archer, in a review of "Breaking a Butterfly", in the Theatre for April 1, 1884, laid particular emphasis on the Norwegian play from which Jones and Herman drew their drama. Archer stressed the triviality of the English play. "Therefore I am prepared for general scepticism when I assert that the play on which it is founded is a very great play, that the character of its heroine is comparable in point of sheer warm-blooded vitality with such a creation as Hetty Sorrel or Maggie Tulliver, and that some of its scenes are of unsurpassed theatrical effect. . . . Take a piece of music, omit all the harmonies, break up and re-arrange the melodic phrases, and then play them with your fore-finger on the pianoforte—do this, and you will have some idea of the process to which Messrs. Jones and Herman have subjected 'A Doll's House'. . . . The expression of the playbill, 'founded on Ibsen's "Nora"' indicates even more than the authors' actual obligation to their original, and would be more exact if it read, 'founded on the ruins of Ibsen's "Nora"'. Let the little play be judged on its own merits,

which are not few ; but let it not be supposed to give the faintest idea of Ibsen's great 'Et dukkehjem'."

Archer himself translated "A Doll's House" in 1889, and offered it to Mr. and Mrs. Charrington for presentation.

From the start Archer had little hope of a successful performance. Ibsen, he felt, was impossible on the English stage. In his article on "Breaking a Butterfly" in the Theatre of April 1, 1884, he had discussed the advisability of producing Ibsen's dramas : "It is this combination of the moralist—or 'immoralist', as some would prefer to say—with the dramatic poet which has given Ibsen his enormous influence in the three Scandinavian kingdoms ; and it is this which makes his plays suffer more than any others by transportation across the Channel. For the British public will not have didactics at any price, and least of all such didactics as Ibsen's. . . . The adapters, or more properly the authors, have felt it needful to eliminate all that was satirical or unpleasant, and in making their work sympathetic they at once made it trivial. I am the last to blame them for doing so. Ibsen on the English stage is impossible. He must be trivialized, and I believe that Messrs. Jones and Herman have performed that office as well as could reasonably be expected." In another passage in the same article, Archer had said of the 1880 performance of "Pillars of Society", that it failed to make any impression on the English public, and he added : "Nevertheless the play, though not in itself such a remarkable work as 'A Doll's House' is probably much better fitted for the English stage, and had I the courage (or audacity) to adapt instead of translating

it, and to transfer the action to England, the result might have been different."

In spite of the fear, therefore, that Ibsen was impossible on the English stage, the performance was undertaken. Herbert Waring, the actor who played Helmer, vividly described his attitude towards the play in an article, "Ibsen in London" in the Theatre of October 1, 1894. He told of reading the play with an effort. He could find no interest in the "frivolous and mendacious heroine", "the painfully self-abnegating Mrs. Linden", "the commonplace and pragmatistical husband", and above all "the morbidly amorous and hereditarily afflicted doctor." The dialogue seemed to him "bald and trivial." He had already guessed the usual happy ending when he came to the final conversation between Nora and Helmer. "Stimulated by a new hope, I read the play through again from beginning to end, and I can honestly say that never before or since have I experienced so much pleasurable excitement in the perusal or representation of any piece. The uninteresting puppets became endowed with an intense actuality; the dialogue which I had previously thought so dull and unimaginative became the cogent and facile medium for the expression of individual and diverse character. Every word of the terse sentences, seemed to have a value of its own, and to suggest some subtle nuance of feeling. I discovered that the character of Krogstad had impressed me on the first reading simply because it was the least complex of the group, and that Nora and Rank and Helmer were living and breathing entities."

Waring went on to describe the enterprise: "The play was rehearsed at the forlorn Novelty Theatre in a spirit

of doubt, with frequent lapses into despondency. This was, however, felt only by the players engaged, for the managers, Mr. and Mrs. Charrington (Miss Achurch) were already keen enthusiasts on the subject. Should we ever get safely to the end of the second act, or would the audience rise in its wrath at the terribly dangerous conversation between Nora and Rank, and denounce us as shameless interpreters of a wantonly pornographic dramatist? Our fears proved groundless; the play went smoothly from start to finish and was received at its close with quite ordinary first-night enthusiasm. Though announced for one week's representation only, the run continued for three weeks in all, and was only cut short by the pre-arranged departure of Mr. and Mrs. Charrington for Australia." Mr. Waring added an amusing story of himself and Archer: "I feel it my painful duty to record that in the first performance of 'A Doll's House' an unfortunate failure of memory caused me to omit the line, 'No man sacrifices his honour, even for one he loves,' thereby precluding Nora's immortal reply, 'Millions of women have done so.' For this momentary lapse, the accomplished and erudite critic already mentioned has, I firmly believe, never quite forgiven me."

The run of "A Doll's House" began on Friday evening, June 7, 1889. Though certain passages were omitted for the sake of compression, the play as performed was essentially Ibsen's. The critics were unanimous in their praise of the acting. Mr. Waring's Helmer and Mr. Charrington's Dr. Rank were lauded on all sides. But Miss Achurch (Mrs. Charrington) as Nora was easily the sensation of the performance. R. H. Hervey in the Theatre

of July 1 said of Miss Achurch: "The character presented enormous difficulties, all of which she triumphantly overcame. Throughout she played with the utmost intelligence, subtlety, intensity, and truth." The *Gentleman's Magazine* of July, 1889, declared: "Much was due, no doubt, to the acting of Miss Janet Achurch as the heroine; a performance so remarkable as to render it a subject of regret that the actress is leaving England for Australia. The play itself, however, took a firm grip upon the public, which was stirred to the depths." E. F. Spence in "Our Stage and Its Critics" pronounces Miss Achurch the most characteristic Nora that England has seen. George Bernard Shaw, in "Dramatic Opinions", crowns Miss Achurch as "the only tragic actress of genius we now possess."

Mr. and Mrs. Charrington took "A Doll's House" in their repertoire on a long Australian tour in 1889. They performed the Ibsen play in America, Australia, New Zealand, and later in India and at the Khedival Theatre in Cairo. It was well received everywhere but in Sidney, where an indignant and outraged audience greeted Nora's exodus with howls and hisses.

It was this remarkable production that first really introduced Ibsen to English theatre-goers. "Quicksands, or the Pillars of Society" was a mere sporadic experiment and "Breaking a Butterfly" was an absurd compromise. But here was the unadulterated Ibsen, acted by the most competent players that the English stage afforded, and success was inevitable. In 1897, in an article in the *Saturday Review* of May 15, Shaw described the Novelty Theatre "A Doll's House" as "the decisive blow

for Ibsen—perhaps the only one that has really got home in England as yet.”

This performance, bringing Ibsen to the fore, started the fierce controversy that followed Ibsen's plays for years after. Faction thundered against faction. The daily papers were full of abuse. And yet, strangely enough, the performance was everywhere praised. Shaw, in the *Saturday Review* of May 22, 1897, described the discussion: “Even the vehemently anti-Ibsenite critics lost all power of discrimination and flattered the performers as frantically as they abused the play.”

For a while the sponsors of Ibsen in England rested on their laurels. On June 6, 1889, the Athenaeum announced: “In consequence of the success of Ibsen's ‘A Doll's House’, his ‘Pillars of Society’ will be revived by Mrs. Oscar Beringer.” But this production had only a single performance, a benefit for Miss Vera Beringer, then playing the title role in “*Little Lord Fauntleroy*.” Between the acts of the play, Mrs. Kendal recited “*Ostler Joe*” and Mme. Antoinette Sterling sang “*The Three Fishers*.”

For several months Ibsen performances in England languished. Then in 1891 there came a revival of interest in the Norwegian playwright, and that year saw six productions of Ibsen's dramas.

The season started with a single matinee performance of “*A Doll's House*” with Miss Marie Fraser as Nora, a part in which she had gained success in the provinces, and Mr. C. Forbes-Drummond as Helmer. The two stars were severely criticised, but the theatrical journals were unanimous in their praise of Mr. Charles Fulton as

Krogstad and of Miss Elizabeth Robins as Mrs. Linden. The Theatre of March 1 praised Mr. Fulton as the best Krogstad London had seen. Miss Robins, a young American actress, was enthusiastically greeted everywhere as a remarkable find. Her performance of Martha Bernick in the 1889 "Pillars of Society" had passed unnoted, but her Mrs. Linden was a decided success. Justin McCarthy, in the Gentleman's Magazine of June, 1891, summed up her acting: "Miss Robins is a very clever actress, an actress with ideas of her own, artistic, sympathetic, imaginative."

The performance as a whole was not particularly noteworthy, but it provoked again a storm of controversy. The Athenaeum of January 31 noted with some alarm that the single performance seemed to revive in its old fury the clamor against Ibsen. "Whatever may be the character of Ibsen's work, it at least stimulates the imagination and furnishes food for afterthought. Whether the wave will sweep over old landmarks in the drama remains to be seen. That its influence is growing day by day is one of the things that he that runs may read."

In February, 1891, "Rosmersholm" was announced for a series of afternoon performances. Mr. Frank R. Benson played Rosmer and Miss Florence Farr, Rebecca. The performance was fairly commendable. The Saturday Review of February 28 pronounced Mr. Benson too weak, Miss Farr intelligent but wanting in passion, Mr. Forde suitably monotonous in the part of Kroll. The Athenaeum of February 28 said: "It is not likely that the English public will soon take to pieces such as 'Rosmersholm', which to the average audience only cease to be dull

when they become monstrous. Not easy, indeed, is it to say whether any great gain would attend their establishment in favour. Before sentence is pronounced upon them, however, it is but just that they should be seen under favorable conditions. Some character was stamped upon Rebecca by Miss Florence Farr, and the bitterness and pedantry of Rector Kroll could scarcely have been rendered more effectively than by Mr. Athol Forde. More than one character seemed misconstrued and the interpretation generally was amateurish." These two accounts merely damn with faint praise. On the whole, the press comments were caustic, leveling mild ridicule at the managers and actors, vehement abuse at the dramatist.

One of the most significant events in the history of Ibsen drama on the English stage was the foundation in 1891 of the Independent Theatre. This gallant organization was created in order that really worth while drama might find production in England. Its short life of six years was a continual struggle against indifference and open abuse, but in spite of its handicaps it managed to make a definite impression on the English public and to influence the English stage.

J. T. Grein, the founder of the Independent Theatre, gave a biography of the organization in Stage Society News of January 25, 1907. Mr. Grein told how he had produced plays of Jones and Pinero in his native country, Holland, in 1890. "So great was the success of these English plays at Amsterdam that the managers of the Royal Subsidized Theatre sent me a cheque for fifty pounds to be used in the interest of art in England. At the same time I had received another cheque for thirty

pounds for the translation of an English play. With these gigantic sums, in the wake of Antoine of Paris, I founded the Independent Theatre, the first performance of which elicited no less than five hundred articles, mostly vituperating Ibsen, whose 'Ghosts' inaugurated the movement, and obtained for me the honorary, if somewhat unflattering title of 'the best abused man in London.' In parenthesis, I should add here that the distinction clung to me for many years, that some families closed their doors against me because I had produced an immoral play, and that a well-known journalist, since dead, refused to be present at a banquet if I were invited. It cost me practically ten years of my life to overcome the prejudice created by an undertaking which even the enemy must admit has left its mark upon the history of our stage. 'Ghosts' was produced on March 9, 1891, under the direction of Mr. Cecil Raleigh, who, together with Mr. George Moore, showed great interest in the little society. Among our first members were George Meredith, Thomas Hardy, A. W. Pinero, H. A. Jones, Mrs. J. R. Green, and many other people of distinction; but in spite of the flourish of adverse trumpets which greeted the birth of the Independent Theatre, the roll of our members never exceeded one hundred and seventy-five, and the income was barely four hundred pounds a year during the whole of its existence. In fact, so poorly was the theatre patronized that in October, 1891, we had only eighty-eight pounds in the bank, and it was due to the help of Frank Harris, Frank Danby, and a few others, that I obtained enough to give a second performance. This was

'Thérèse Raquin' of Zola, and again the air was pregnant with abusive language."

The Athenaeum of March 21, in describing the ferment caused by the creation of the Independent Theatre, said: "All the unreasoning hostility of the Englishman to innovation has been provoked, and in addition to the general condemnation of the theatrical reporters or critics, the leader-writers have entered the arena and belaboured all concerned in the undertaking."

The Independent Theatre inaugurated its career with an invitation performance of "Ghosts" on Friday, March 13, 1891. Angered as were the London theatrical critics, they yet gave grudging praise to the actors. The Athenaeum of March 21 admitted: "In the case of plays so amateurish in many respects as those of Ibsen an amateurish interpretation is not wholly unsuitable. It is certain that the interpreters of 'Ghosts', unknown as they are to fame, gave a serious and competent rendering of the strange and uncanny characters whom Ibsen has planted in Mrs. Alving's house on one of the western fjords of Norway."

Newspaper controversy had been started with the Charington performance of "A Doll's House" in 1889. Miss Fraser's "A Doll's House" in January, 1891, and Miss Farr's "Rosmersholm" in February, had revived the controversy. But it was "Ghosts" that really caused the storm to break with full force. The entire British press poured bitter abuse and condemnation over Ibsen, Grein, Archer and the actors. Ibsen became a household word. Behind the time indeed was the journal that omitted its daily column or so on Ibsen's iniquities.

Undaunted by the storm of abuse, two young American actresses, Elizabeth Robins and Marion Lea, joined forces to perform Ibsen's new play, "Hedda Gabler", at five consecutive matinees at the Vaudeville Theatre.

The press comments on the acting were unanimously enthusiastic. The Athenaeum of April 25 praised the performance heartily: "Under circumstances that bespeak much courage on the part of two of our younger actresses, 'Hedda Gabler', Ibsen's latest drama, has been given, not in the surreptitious style adopted with his 'Ghosts', but in the light of full publicity. . . . 'Hedda Gabler' gains in intelligibility from interpretation. It is grim and unholy, but painfully actual and true. Miss Elizabeth Robins gives an admirable representation of Hedda, 'full of subtlety and variety, and Miss Marion Lea shows with artistic truth the meek, lachrymose Thea. Mr. Sugden's Judge Brack is an excellent performance, and Miss Cowen, Miss Chapman, Mr. Scott Buist and Mr. Elwood make up an excellent cast."

The May 1 number of the Theatre said: "This, the latest of Henrik Ibsen's plays, appears to average commonsense people the most motiveless of any he has written. . . . The audience that was present on Monday afternoon was one the members of which for the most part believe in Ibsen, but I will also say that the remainder appeared interested; but then, this was, one might say, a picked audience, prepared at least to think on the play and critically watch the acting." The acting, the Theatre declared, was excellent. Miss Robins was subtle, refined, convincing. Miss Lea handled her character delicately.

In the Gentleman's Magazine of June, 1891, Justin

McCarthy declared that: "Miss Robins' Hedda Gabler is not Ibsen's Hedda Gabler. But . . . it is indeed a very remarkable, very powerful, very picturesque piece of acting. . . . The most satisfactory study in the whole cast to the serious student of Ibsen, was the Judge Brack of Mr. Sugden. This is far and away the best thing Mr. Sugden has done. . . . He is the man to the very life."

E. F. Spence, in "Our Stage and Its Critics", says that England has never seen a Hedda, a Hilda, or a Mrs. Linden comparable to Miss Robins.

The theatre was crowded and the audience an enthusiastic one. The performance was generally acclaimed the best Ibsen production up to that time. On April 29, Ibsen wrote from Munich thanking Archer for his letter "telling me that 'Hedda Gabler' met with a unanimously favorable reception at its first appearance in London."

The success of "Hedda Gabler" encouraged Mr. Thorne to put it into the regular evening bill of the Vaudeville in the first week in May. "Hedda Gabler" was played until May 31, when it was taken off the boards in the very height of its success. The Athenaeum of June 6 commented on the venture: "Great credit is reflected on the two clever, courageous and persevering young actresses to whom the production is due. Under difficult conditions, and in the face of opposition scarcely short of persecution, they have made a gallant fight and have enabled a large number of playgoers to judge for themselves of a work that has caused one of the keenest controversies of the day."

On May 11 there was produced for the first time in

England "The Lady from the Sea". The performance was, on the whole, inadequate. The interpretation was languid and unconvincing. The Theatre of June 1 criticised the production: "This play, that promised more perhaps than any other if it were put upon the stage, proved in representation the most disappointing of any of Ibsen's yet seen in England."

A fairly satisfactory performance of "A Doll's House", with Miss Norreys as Nora, ended the 1891 season, a season remarkable because of the number of Ibsen productions, because of the founding of the Independent Theatre and the "Ghosts" controversy, and because of the brilliance of the "Hedda Gabler" of Miss Robins and Miss Lea.

In 1892, Mr. and Mrs. Charrington returned from a long tour, and reopened the Avenue Theatre with a revival of "A Doll's House." Mrs. Charrington as Nora was again enthusiastically greeted by the audience and the press. She repeated her role again and again during the following seasons.

One of the most successful of the English Ibsen productions was "The Master Builder", played in 1893 under the direction of Herbert Waring and Elizabeth Robins. The English performance antedated any Scandinavian presentation. London saw the third European production, following only Berlin and Leipsic.

The storm of abuse that had followed Ibsen plays in England now gave way to merciless ridicule, a far more powerful weapon. But no theatrical critic was so blinded by prejudice as to withhold from the actors the praise that their masterly efforts merited. Everyone admitted

that the play was magnificently acted and that it lent itself admirably to stage presentation. Waring's Solness was on all sides pronounced excellent, and Miss Robins was everywhere acclaimed superb.

A typical criticism is that appearing in the Theatre of April 1, 1893. After a few paragraphs of bitter ridicule, the critic proceeded: "And but for the truly remarkable and brilliant acting of Miss Robins and Mr. Waring, it is hard to imagine an average audience having the patience to sit it through. Their grip and intensity and apparent belief in the humanity of Solness and Hilda, are however to be classed among the worthiest achievements of the modern stage. The Hilda, frequently compared to the dawning of the day, the rising of the sun, and so on, and equal to rendering these comparisons wondrously vivid and eloquent, is indeed a marvellous effort. From beginning to end there is not the faintest trace of Miss Robins—Miss Robins of the musical low voice, love of the minor chords, somewhat lackadaisical manner, and crushed and broken expression. All the customary tell-tale characteristics have vanished, and in their place is as radiant, vigorous, determined, buoyant a girl as one could well conceive. The stage is lightened by her presence. She seems to dissipate the gloom, just as Solness says. She is the embodiment of youth and health and brightness, and a robust conscience. The study is cleverer even than her Hedda Gabler, cleverer even than Miss Achurch's first Nora Helmer. . . . Occasionally an unkind laugh—a laugh at the dramatist—broke upon the stillness of the air, but for the most part the play was listened to in respectful (not to say reverential) silence, and

the unanimous applause of a crowded house apparently sealed it a success."

Archer has pronounced Miss Robins "almost an ideal Hilda," and Shaw believes her to be the greatest Hilda England ever saw.

In an article "Ibsen in London" in the Theatre of October 1, 1894, Mr. Waring said of "The Master Builder": "As the work was delivered to us hot from the press we were denied the advantage of the critical analysis and speculation as to the author's hidden meaning with which the London papers were rife for several weeks after the production. We had to disregard all considerations of allegorical significance, and simply to take the story as we found it. . . . I do not think it is possible for any actor to traject into the mind of his audience at a single sitting a full comprehension of matter which he himself has only understood after long days of laborious study. At all events, I am conscious myself of more or less complete failure in this respect. Nevertheless, as I have said, the study of this part was a labour of love to me. As one of the managers, I confess with pain that it was a labour of, or for, nothing else."

After a fortnight of matinees at the Trafalgar Square Theatre, where the play attracted large audiences, it was taken to the Vaudeville Theatre on Monday evening, March 6, for a regular run that lasted until Passion Week ended it on March 30.

Encouraged by her success as Hilda, Miss Robins arranged a short Ibsen season at the Opera Comique in June. "Hedda Gabler", "Rosmersholm", and "The Master Builder" each had two matinee and two evening per-

formances. With "The Master Builder" there was performed the fourth act of "Brand", which proved the chief attraction.

According to the Theatre of July 1, Miss Robins was slower, heavier, more peevish and less masterful than she had been in her first performance of the play. Mr. Waller as Lövborg showed a man more forcible and sensitive than the one Mr. Elwood had drawn; but the uncanny suggestion of genius was wanting. Mr. Sugden and Mr. Buist were much the same as they had been in the 1891 production. Miss Linden played Mrs. Elvsted with prettiness and simplicity, but without a hint of tragic pathos.

As Rebecca, Miss Robins was enthusiastically praised. "She and Mr. Waller speedily wiped out the dismal memory of that sultry afternoon at the Vaudeville, when Mr. Benson and Miss Florence Farr, as Rosmer and Rebecca, spoke their words—merely spoke and nothing more. The intense feeling infused into their long scenes lent the new guilty couple an absorbing interest." Mr. Buist was effective, and Mr. Gould gave a light and playful touch to his happy satire of Brendel.

Of "The Master Builder", the Theatre said that it "revealed Mr. Waller in a new light. As Solness he looked beneath the surface of the part, abandoned the hero's claim to be heroic, and played not like a leading actor, but the unhinged architect of Ibsen's puzzling pages."

Miss Ivor was good as Mrs. Solness, making the character younger than the usual Mrs. Solness. "Miss Robins' Hilda remained what at first it was, a remarkable example of pure audacity in art, an effort so bracing and breezy that it stopped the questions that flew to the lips

and permitted nothing but a sense of supreme exhilaration."

Miss Robins' acting in "Brand" provoked favorable comment from all sides. The Theatre of July 1 said: "Every pitiable stage of the bereaved Agnes' final suffering received woe-begone expression and was dwelt upon at realistic length. Every agony was lived through, humbly, quietly, with scarcely audible dry stifled sobs and fond caressing murmurs that would have melted a stone. The figure of the woman robbed of her last cold comfort—the clothes of her dead child—induced an abiding compassion, and as an example of pure pathos will not easily be superseded. Miss Ivor gave picturesque expression to the coarse flouts and jeers of the Gypsy shrew, and Mr. Bernard Gould was interesting if not wholly satisfactory as Brand. Only two satisfying conceptions of Brand seem possible; one that of an iron-willed fanatic, the other of a man possessed by a religious frenzy. Neither of these was suggested by Mr. Gould, whose acting lacked authority and the will force necessary to control and subdue even so mild and meek an Agnes as Miss Robins."

In the autumn of 1894, Miss Robins took "Hedda Gabler" and "The Master Builder" to Manchester and other large English cities.

In May, 1893, Signora Eleanora Duse opened her London engagement, that included Italian performances of "Camille", "Fedora", "Cavalleria Rusticana", "La Locandiera", "Antony and Cleopatra", and "A Doll's House".

London critics disagreed as to Signora Duse's production. Some, as the dramatic critic of the Theatre, praised her quiet, beautiful art. "Where, however, in-

evitably her greatness will eventually be shown is in the absolute inability of anyone who has once seen her to ever again accept the old-style acting as supreme. Again, like Ibsen, she effects a revolution with every performance." Others, as the critic of the *Athenaeum* of June 17, expressed disappointment: "The conversations with Mrs. Linden have irresistible vivacity and variety. The actress sits on a stool at the feet of her friend, kisses her with caressing tenderness, hugs her, and plays all sorts of tricks, all of them delightful, and some of them fantastic. We are less impressed, however, by her unrest than by her seductiveness, and, while admiring her petulance, are not convinced of the necessity for her sacrifice. Add to this that she exhibits in the piece no pathos, and that she leaves the tarantella undanced, and the fact that she is not Ibsen's Nora seems patent."

It was ten years later when Signora Duse played another Ibsen character in London. This time she presented "*Hedda Gabler*." The *Athenaeum* of October 10 felt that her conception of the character was not entirely clear, but praised her perfect method. Two years later, in 1905, Signora Duse repeated her presentation of *Hedda*, again meeting a rather indifferent audience, and a rather patronizing press.

Signora Duse was the first of a series of foreign players who enacted Ibsen roles in England. The most of them met no more gracious reception than had their great predecessor. It was unpleasant enough to have to see foreign drama, but to have to see foreign drama acted in a foreign tongue by foreign actors—it was a bit too much for the British public!

German companies presented "A Doll's House" in 1894, "Hedda Gabler" in 1901, "The Wild Duck" in 1905, and "Rosmersholm" in 1906.

In 1895, the Theatre de l'Oeuvre de Paris presented French versions of "Rosmersholm" and "The Master Builder." Shaw, in the Saturday Review of May 22, 1897, favorably commented on the performance of "Rosmersholm" as a harmonious whole. In "Dramatic Opinions" he praised "The Master Builder". M. Lugne-Poë was an inimitable Solness. His master builder with his vulgar trousers and red nose was amazingly true to life. The character was a combination of energy, talent, covetousness, egotism, and sentimentality. But few London critics shared Shaw's opinion, and the French performances, like the German, were dismissed with a line or two.

In June, 1903, Madame Réjane, the first French Nora, played "Maison de Poupée" in London. The Athenaeum of June 27 praised her performance, but preferred to it the Noras of Miss Achurch and Signora Duse.

Madame Lydia Yavorska, Countess Bariatinsky, played in London from 1909 to 1911. Her repertoire included "Hedda Gabler" and "A Doll's House". She was the most successful of the foreign interpreters of Ibsen, largely because she played in English, assisted by a popular English supporting company. A strange, fierce type of acting made her a theatrical sensation. The Athenaeum of December 11, 1909, pronounced her Hedda too melodramatic, though splendid in her feverish gaiety. The Academy said, of her Nora: "Her fire, her passion, the wonderfully rapid and convincing changes of her expres-

sion, her quick, lithe movements, make a sensation to which we are hardly accustomed in this country,"¹ and of her Hedda: "Madame Yavorska finds in Hedda a character peculiarly suited to the wonderful acting with which she has surprised those who have seen her."²

All of the foreign performances of Ibsen seem to have been regarded as doubly exotic, and were attended with curiosity rather than with appreciation and sympathy. Probably not even Signora Duse had any marked influence on English interpretation of Ibsen roles.

The first of the popular English "actor-managers" to attempt an Ibsen drama was Mr. H. Beerbohm Tree, who produced "An Enemy of the People" on June 14, 1893. He played Dr. Thomas Stockmann, with Mr. E. M. Robson as Aslaksen.

Mrs. George Cran in her biography, "H. Beerbohm Tree" says of "An Enemy of the People": "In his first creation, Mr. Tree lost the proportion of the part, and exaggerated the comic aspect; his greed for improvement soon showed him the error of what he was doing, and he pulled the character together, making of it a fine, coherent part."

Mr. Tree's Stockmann was deservedly praised on all sides. The combination of a capable and very popular actor and an Ibsen play that contains little to offend the sensibilities of the English public, completely won over the critics. The Theatre of July 1, 1893, gives an enthusiastic account of the performance: "It is not very often that an actor improves upon his author when the lat-

¹Academy, March 11, 1911.

²Academy, June 3, 1911.

ter is a genius. But Mr. Beerbohm Tree has done it. Stockmann in Ibsen's play is a tragedian. A kind of Don Quixote, tilting at municipal windmills, he is obviously drawn as a fanatic, a single-minded iconoclast. That is good. But the tragi-comedy Mr. Tree reads into him is better. Broader, more human, and more sympathetic, the new Stockmann drives home the truth of the play with immeasurably increased force. . . . Breezy, impulsive, vigorous, he dominated the stage." Robson was fine as Aslaksen. "There has been nothing on the stage more unobtrusively humorous than this leader of 'the compact majority' for many a day."

Mr. Tree's first matinee of "An Enemy of the People" was such a marked success that the play was never after absent from his repertoire. He revived it again and again in London, the provinces, and America. When newer plays failed, Mr. Tree could always gain applause with his inimitable Stockmann. Mrs. George Cran described vividly a particularly timely revival in 1906: "During the revival in the Spring of 1906 some of the lines acquired such special point that the audiences invariably thought Mr. Tree was 'gagging'. Balfour was daily losing ground, and the Liberals were being returned in their numbers for the new Parliament. Night after night the action of the play was suspended to give way to a storm of hooting sprinkled with cheers from the house, when the actor voiced his legitimate lines, 'The damned compact Liberal majority!'"

"Little Eyolf" was written in 1894. In December of that year the play was presented in the original Norwegian and in Archer's English version as a copyright per-

formance. The first professional performance of "Little Eyolf" in English took place in November, 1896. The distinguished cast included Mr. Thorpe as Allmers, Miss Achurch as Rita, Miss Robins as Asta, and Mrs. Patrick Campbell as The Rat Wife. The production was one of the most vivid and brilliant performances of Ibsen in England. The Athenaeum of November 28, while blaming Ibsen for lack of modesty, and declaring that—"the whole strikes us as the dream of a blind man concerning colour—a schoolboy's conception of an orgie"—had nothing but praise for the actors.

In the Saturday Review of November 28, 1896, Shaw said: "The performance was of course a very remarkable one. When, in a cast of five, you have the three best yet discovered actresses of their generation, you naturally look for something extraordinary. . . . Miss Achurch was more than equal to the occasion. Her power seemed to grow with its own expenditure. . . . She played with all her old originality and success, and with more than her old authority over her audience. . . . Being myself a devotee of the beautiful school, I like being enchanted by Mrs. Patrick Campbell better than being frightened, harrowed, astonished, conscience-stricken, devastated, and dreadfully delighted in general by Miss Achurch's untamed genius. I have seen Mrs. Campbell play the Rat Wife twice. . . . She played supernaturally, beautifully. . . . Of Miss Robins' Asta it is difficult to say much, since the part, played as she plays it, does not exhibit anything like the full extent of her powers. . . . Asta was only a picture. . . . Mr. Courtenay Thorpe played very intelligently. . . .

Master Stewart Dawson, as Eyolf, was one of the best actors in the company."

Miss Achurch was singularly impressive, but the venture was not profitable; and so the part of Rita was unwisely given to Mrs. Patrick Campbell in the hope of attracting her large personal following. Miss Florence Farr was given the Rat Wife. This cast gave a series of evening performances until December 19. Mrs. Campbell made a lovely and charming Rita, but lacked the fire and brilliancy of Miss Achurch. The first cast produced a truly memorable performance of Ibsen's vivid play.

The first English performance of "John Gabriel Borkman" was less successful. An organization called the New Century Theatre produced the play in 1897 with Mr. Vernon as Borkman, Miss Genevieve Ward as Mrs. Borkman, and Miss Robins as Ella Rentheim, but in spite of the admirable cast the performance was not entirely satisfactory.

Shaw, in the Saturday Review of May 8, described the acting of the play as "fairly good, as acting goes in London now, whenever the performers were at all in their depth; it was at least lugubriously well intentioned when they were out of it. . . . The Ibsenite actor marks the speeches that are beyond him by a sudden access of pathetic sentimentality and an intense consciousness of Ibsen's greatness . . . its effect is as false as false can be; and I am sorry to say that it is gradually establishing a funereally unreal tradition which is likely to end in making Ibsen the most portentous of stage bores." Miss Robins, he said, was "too young and too ferociously individualistic" to play Ella. "Mr. Vernon's Borkman was

not ill acted; only as it was not Ibsen's Borkman, but the very reverse and negation of him, the better Mr. Vernon acted the worse it was for the play. He was a thoroughly disillusioned elderly man of business, patient and sensible rather than kindly, and with the sort of strength that a man derives from the experience that teaches him his limits. . . . Ibsen's Borkman, on the contrary, is a man of the most energetic imagination, whose illusions feed on his misfortunes, and whose conception of his own power grows hyperbolic and Napoleonic in his solitude and impotence."

In 1897, the Independent Theatre was discontinued, after a six years' career of continual struggle. But, though the organization constantly faced financial failure, and though it was always handicapped by an apathetic public and an inimical press, it still maintained its unswervingly high standard of production. The value of the Independent Theatre presentations of modern plays can hardly be overestimated; and the Ibsen productions were by no means the least valuable.

Two years after its initial performance, the Independent Theatre revived "Ghosts" in January, 1893. Owing to the Censor's ban on a public performance of the play, none but invited guests were present. Mrs. Patrick Campbell played Mrs. Alving admirably, and Miss Hall Caine was an ideal Regina.

The following year the Independent Theatre staged the first English performance of "The Wild Duck". The cast included Mr. Charles Fulton as Gregers Werle, Mr. Abingdon as Hialmar, Mr. Laurence Irving as Relling, Mrs. Herbert Waring as Gina, and Miss Winifred Fraser

as Hedvig. The production was not entirely successful, though it gave opportunity for some remarkable acting. Of Fulton, Herbert Waring said: "I have never seen a more complete incarnation of any part than the Gregers Werle of Mr. Charles Fulton."¹ The Theatre of June 1 praised especially the acting of Mrs. Waring, Miss Fraser and Mr. Fulton. Gina, it said, was an absorbing study in naturalness, remarkably clever in a simple, restrained and homely way. Even better was the wistful, wondering Hedvig. Gregers was strong and boldly outlined.

In November, 1894, the Independent Theatre was turned into a company with a capital of forty-five hundred pounds. Miss Dorothy Leighton was appointed assistant director to Mr. Grein. In November of the following year, Mr. Grein retired from his directorship.

In May, 1897, under the direction of Miss Leighton and Mr. Charles Charrington, the Independent Theatre revived "A Doll's House". The performance was an admirable one. Archer, in the World, May 19, said of Miss Achurch's performance that many people thought it her best. "Perhaps it was; but I must own to a rooted prejudice in favour of the old Nora, the Nora of 1889. So clear and detailed is my remembrance of that creation, that it necessarily renders me unjust to the Nora of to-day. Every divergence from the old reading, were it never so great an improvement, would jar on me simply as a thing new and unexpected." Of the Helmer, Mr. Archer said: "Excellent as was Mr. Waring's Helmer in the original production, I think Mr. Courtenay Thorpe was, or with a little more preparation might have been,

¹Theatre, October 1, 1894.

even better. . . . His performance was excellent, an original character-study, and, in the last act, luminous and daring. . . . Mr. Charrington resumed his old part of Rank, and played it effectively. . . . Mr. Fulton's Krogstad promised excellently, but became too rough and loud as his scenes went on." In the Saturday Review of May 15, Shaw pronounced Courtenay Thorpe the best Helmer so far. "Ibsen has in this case repeated his old feat of making an actor's reputation."

The Independent Theatre revived "The Wild Duck" in May, 1897, under the management of Mr. Charrington. Though the play suffered from insufficient rehearsal, the performance was a very creditable one.

The Athenaeum of May 22 praised Miss Fraser's Hedvig, Miss Phillips' Gina, Mr. Outram's Werle, and Mr. Thorpe's Gregers. Hialmar it declared to be Mr. Irving's best role.

In the World of May 26, Archer lauded the intelligence and originality of Mr. Thorpe. His Gregers "was a very spirited sketch of a very difficult part. It suffered, like his Helmer from hasty preparation . . . it was a most able effort at characterization. . . . Mr. Laurence Irving showed a very intelligent appreciation of the humor of Hialmar Ekdal, but his technical resources are as yet scarcely adequate to such an exacting part. Mr. James Welch was good as old Ekdal, but did not bring out the character as clearly as I should have expected. Mr. Charrington gave a marked physiognomy to Relling, and Mr. Leonard Outram was good as old Werle. Miss Kate Phillips was rather out of her element in the part of Gina, but Miss Ffolliott Paget was excellent as Mrs.

Sörby, and Miss Winifred Fraser repeated her pathetically beautiful rendering of little Hedvig."

Bernard Shaw discussed the acting in the Saturday Review of May 22. "Mr. Irving's acting was a remarkable achievement, and fairly entitles him to patronize his father as an old-fashioned actor who has positively never played a leading Ibsen part. . . . Mr. Welch's Ekdal left nothing to be said; it was faultless. . . . Mr. Charrington played Relling with great artistic distinction; nobody else got so completely free from conventional art or so convincingly behind the part and the play as he."

For the third time, the Independent Theatre presented "Ghosts". Because of the Censor's ruling, this was again a private performance. Shaw, in the Saturday Review of June 26, 1897, described Mrs. Wright's Mrs. Alving as an achievement quite beyond the culture of any other actress of her generation. Mr. Thorpe's Oswald he felt to be too romantically horrible. Mr. C. E. Montague, in "Dramatic Values", praised Thorpe's Oswald as a "giant effort of imagination."

Appropriately enough, the Independent Theatre's last Ibsen production, as well as its first, was "Ghosts". The fight had been a brave one, but England was not at that time ready for such an organization, and the Independent Theatre died in 1897.

But its successor was not far off. Two years later, in the summer of 1899, a few enthusiastic lovers of the stage organized a small society "to secure the production of plays of obvious power and merit which lacked, under the conditions then prevalent on the stage, any opportunity for their presentation." The performances of the Incor-

porated Stage Society took place on Sundays before an audience composed of the members of the society and their friends. Of the fifty productions of the Society's ten years of existence, five were of Ibsen's dramas. The large membership of the society—in 1906 it had twelve hundred members—contributed materially to its great success.

The Incorporated Stage Society gave its first Ibsen performance in February, 1900. This has been the only English performance of "The League of Youth". The admirable cast included Mr. Titheradge, Mr. Granville Barker, Miss Fraser, Mr. Thorpe, and Mr. Charrington. The acting was delightful.

In May, 1901, the Incorporated Stage Society produced "Pillars of Society" under the direction of Mr. Oscar Asche. The Athenaeum of May 18 pronounced this an interesting and creditable performance. Mr. J. T. Grein, in "Dramatic Criticism", said of the performance: "I am glad to say that 'The Pillars of Society' was, on the whole, given with great credit to every body concerned." He particularly praised the charm of Miss Robertson, the pathos of Mrs. Maltby and the intensity of Mr. Gran's acting. Of Mr. Asche he said: "I wish to pay my tribute to Mr. Oscar Asche, who was not only the organizer of the performance, but also its life and soul in the personality of Consul Bernick. . . . It was a fine effort, worthy of a true artist."

The Incorporated Stage Society presented "The Lady from the Sea" in May, 1902. The acting was pleasing. Mr. Montague in "Dramatic Opinions" complains that Miss Achurch as Ellida did not make the part smack of

the sea, but the greater part of the press comment was favorable. The Athenaeum of May 10 praised Miss Achurch highly and admitted that the play took a firm hold upon the public, but declared that "such merit as it possesses is poetic rather than dramatic. . . . The denouement of the play is, however, unsatisfactory and the whole suffers from that parochialism of which Ibsen rarely divests himself."

The Westminster Review of July, 1902, said: "Ellida is . . . a creature of absolute impulse. . . . An intellectual actress, like Miss Achurch, however able her interpretation may be, fails to represent Ibsen's Ellida. It is a tremendous part, and one is grateful for the opportunity of seeing it even attempted. Miss Achurch's rendering was as fine as it could be, in its way. . . . Her natural easy method is the right one. . . . Mr. Norman McKinnel was a wholly admirable Dr. Wangel, and the scenes between him and Miss Achurch were a rare artistic treat. Mr. Laurence Irving succeeded in imparting a certain weirdness to the difficult part of the Stranger, but he was scarcely 'alluring', and this again is of the essence of the part. The other players, particularly Mr. Arthur Royston, as the young sculptor, Lyngstrand, were on a more than ordinary level of excellence."

Ibsen's last play, "When We Dead Awaken", received its initial production in January, 1903. The Incorporated Stage Society secured for this presentation Mr. Tithe-radge for Rubek, Miss Hackney for Maia, Mr. Irving for Ulfheim, and Miss Watson for Irene. The performance was only fairly successful. The Athenaeum of January 31, 1903, pronounced the play unfit for the stage

since essentially undramatic, but added that it gave singular opportunity for acting. Mr. Irving and Miss Watson were particularly praised.

The final Ibsen production of the Incorporated Stage Society was the early play "Lady Inger of Ostrat", January, 1906. A note on the program read: "'Lady Inger of Ostrat' was written in 1855. In conception and execution it is in almost startling contrast with what are called Ibsen's social dramas. The workmanship, though extremely interesting to anyone studying the development of Ibsen's art, is in many ways curiously naive and old-fashioned. Soliloquies and asides meet us at every turn. In the social dramas they can scarcely be found. The plot, with all its mistaken identities, its mysterious strangers, its sons spirited away from their mothers, is more like 'Hernani' than 'Hedda Gabler'. In technique, in fact, it is nearer to 'Le Verre d'Eau' than to 'The Wild Duck'. To anyone, therefore, who looks to Ibsen solely as a master of technique, 'Lady Inger of Ostrat' will come as something of a disappointment. But to anyone who wishes to see from what humble beginnings that flawless technique sprang, and to trace its germ in the less-sure touch of the master's early work, the play cannot fail to be interesting."

Miss Edyth Olive played Lady Inger, Mr. Ainley played Nils Lykke, and Mr. Harcourt Williams Nils Stensson. The performance was a success because of the excellent acting. The play itself succeeded only in puzzling an audience unable to follow intrigue and counter-intrigue through the bewildering action.

The Incorporated Stage Society was a thoroughly suc-

cessful project, well accomplishing its purpose of introducing to the English public the best of modern and classic plays.

An equally successful enterprise was the Barker-Vedrenne partnership. The Court Theatre matinee project was inaugurated in 1904. Back in 1899, Granville Barker had been connected with the Incorporated Stage Society. He had acted in the performances, and had seen two of his plays presented by the Society. He met Mr. Vedrenne, an enterprising manager, and discussed with him a project for running a stock company in some small theatre. Mr. Vedrenne was interested, but the matter went no further, owing to lack of capital.

In February, 1904, Mr. J. H. Leigh, proprietor of the Court Theatre, was giving a series of Shakespeare revivals with Mr. Vedrenne as manager. Mr. Leigh asked Mr. Barker to superintend the production of "Two Gentlemen of Verona". Mr. Barker consented on the condition that he be allowed to give five or six matinees of "Candida" with Mr. Vedrenne as joint manager. His proposal was accepted and from this there grew the permanent Vedrenne-Barker alliance.

In 1905, Mr. Vedrenne became the lessee of the Court Theatre. The Vedrenne-Barker performances began in 1904, and lasted until June 29, 1907. During that time thirty-two plays by seventeen authors were produced, and nine hundred and forty-six performances were given. Of these, seven hundred and one performances were of eleven plays by Bernard Shaw. Ibsen was represented by two plays.

In October, 1905, Mr. Barker and Mr. Vedrenne pre-

sented "The Wild Duck" at the Court Theatre. Mr. Desmond McCarthy, in his book on "The Court Theatre", says that "The Wild Duck" was rather disappointing. "Though each part was admirably played, as a whole it was not so impressive as the performances of Herr Andresen's company. . . . Granville Barker's . . . Hjalmar Ekdal was a pitiable and ridiculous figure instead of a repulsive and ridiculous one. . . . The fault we have to find with Mr. Barker's interpretation is that it is too good-natured. . . . Mr. George, as Old Ekdal, was good, especially in the first act. . . . Miss Agnes Thomas was the best English Gina I remember. . . . Miss Dorothy Minto's Hedvig was particularly good. . . . Mr. Lang's Relling could only have been improved in one respect, which was not in his power to remedy. In casting the part of Relling, I believe the important quality to look for in the personality of the actor is his voice."

Mr. Vedrenne and Mr. Barker produced "Hedda Gabler" at the Court Theatre in March, 1907. The cast included Mr. Trevor Lowe as Tesman, Mr. James Hearn as Judge Brack, Mr. Laurence Irving as Eilert, and Mrs. Patrick Campbell as Hedda. This admirable performance was enthusiastically received by the public.

Mr. McCarthy in "The Court Theatre" says: "The performance of 'Hedda Gabler' was better than that of 'The Wild Duck'. It is seldom so remarkable a play is so remarkably acted. Mrs. Patrick Campbell's acting of Hedda was not one hair's-breadth out. Hedda, as a character, strikes us at once monstrous and familiar. . . . Mrs. Patrick Campbell became the character to the life.

It speaks wonders for the Court Theatre management that she did not act the others off the stage. Mr. Trevor Lowe, as George Tesman, Hedda's husband, was excellent, and Mr. James Hearn's Judge Brack was a good piece of careful acting. Lövborg's entrance the morning after the debauch, in which he has lost his manuscript and his self-respect, was most impressive. Mr. Laurence Irving can, as the phrase is, 'look volumes'."

All England gasped when, in 1903, Miss Ellen Terry announced her determination to produce an Ibsen play. She presented "The Vikings at Helgeland" for the week beginning April 13, 1903, with a remarkable cast including Mr. Hubert Carter, Mr. Holman Clark, Mr. Oscar Asche, Mr. Mark Kinghorne and Mr. Tearle. Miss Terry was stage manager. The costumes were by her daughter, Miss Edith Craig, the scenery and lighting by Mr. Gordon Craig.

The Athenaeum of April 25 commented: "The play, though undeniably gloomy, is powerfully conceived and intensely dramatic." It praised Miss Terry's masterly performance, and preferred the acting of Mr. Clark to that of the other men.

The setting of the play was particularly noteworthy. For some time Gordon Craig had been evolving his theories of stage-craft, but had had no opportunity of putting them into practice. There is little doubt that Ellen Terry selected this colorful play in order to enable her son to materialize his interesting ideas on staging. "The Vikings at Helgeland" was the first play produced with the Gordon Craig stage-craft that has since revolutionized English dramatic productions.

Discriminating critics everywhere praised the scenic effects in "The Vikings at Helgeland". Max Beerbohm in the *Saturday Review* of April 25, dwelt on the perfect stage managing, and the beauty of the strange, supernatural effects in the setting.

During the years 1907 to 1914, Ibsen was summarily appropriated by amateur societies as their own peculiar property. As the *Athenaeum* remarked in relieved tones, "Fortunately 'Rosmersholm' is an actor-proof play",¹ and even a very poor Rebecca can somehow convey the emotion of Ibsen's drama. But some of these amateur performances were of great value.

The English Drama Society first attempted an Ibsen play in 1907, when it presented "The Master Builder" for a week in May. In November, 1911, the Society played the last four acts of "The Wild Duck". In that same month the Drama Society gave "Hedda Gabler", with Mr. Leigh Lovel as Tesman and Miss Octavia Kenmore as Hedda. In November and December, 1912, the Society again presented Miss Kenmore as Hedda. A single performance of "When We Dead Awaken", in December, 1913, ended the Drama Society's Ibsen productions.

Miss Kenmore, who had starred in a few performances of the Drama Society, was an actress of unusual experience in Ibsen. She and Mr. Lovel were the mainstays of the Adelphi Repertory Company, which for six years had played Ibsen dramas throughout the English provinces. Miss Kenmore and Mr. Lovel had appeared in more Ibsen performances than any other actors in the world. The Adelphi Repertory Company produced

¹*Athenaeum*, February 15, 1908.

"Rosmersholm" in London in May, 1911, and March, 1912, and "A Doll's House" in March and October, 1912.

An amateur society, the Adelphi Play Society, inaugurated its career by a performance of "Ghosts" in June, 1911. The Academy of July 1 praised the entire cast enthusiastically. The Society played "Peer Gynt" on June 2, 1912.

The Play Actors, another amateur organization, performed "Brand" in November, 1912. The acting was on a high level throughout.

In 1910 there was founded in London the Ibsen Club, an organization of young enthusiasts banded together to study and perform the dramas of Ibsen. This indefatigable little group performed in the entirety or in part almost all of Ibsen's plays, including "Peer Gynt", "Brand", "Olaf Liliekrans", "The Hero's Mound", as well as the more popular "A Doll's House", "Ghosts", etc. The plays usually had only a single performance each at the Club's studio or at the little Rehearsal Theatre, on Sunday evenings.

On Sunday, February 26, 1911, scenes from "Peer Gynt" were produced for the first time in England. The Ibsen Club repeated its performance several times later. Strangely enough, in this first production a woman, Miss Pax Robertson, played Peer. The Club gave the first English performance of Ibsen's youthful work "Olaf Liliekrans", in June, 1911. "When We Dead Awaken" was presented by the Ibsen Club in the December of that year. In May, 1912, the Club presented selections from "Peer Gynt" and "A Doll's House", and gave the first performance in England of Ibsen's early play, "The

Hero's Mound". These are a few of the more unusual programs of the Ibsen Club. But hardly a play of Ibsen's was neglected in its meetings.

Miss Rosina Filippi, an instructor in acting, presented several Ibsen plays with her students as actors. In October, 1910, she first produced "John Gabriel Borkman". She repeated the play in January, 1911. Miss Filippi herself played Mrs. Borkman. Her acting was termed by the Times of January 27, 1911, "a magnificent performance." She produced "A Doll's House" in January, 1914.

One of the latest and one of the finest of the Ibsen performances was "The Pretenders", produced at the Haymarket Theatre in February, 1913. The cast included Mr. Gill as Hakon, Mr. Irving as Earl Skule, Mr. Haviland as Bishop Nicholas, Mr. Rathbone as Jatgeir Skald, and Miss Netta Westcott as Margrete.

The Athenaeum of February 22 praised the performance highly. The setting was artistic and effective. The acting was noteworthy. Mr. Haviland was forceful, though the death scene was not up to his level. Mr. Gill was dignified and altogether admirable. Mr. Irving was not up to his usual standard. Miss Westcott was excellent.

The Academy of February 22 said: "Mr. William Haviland as the Bishop gave a very fine and subtle performance. . . . Mr. Basil Gill, with his resolute manner and manly speech, made it convincing. Mr. Laurence Irving took the part of Skule. It is the best thing he has done yet. . . . Mr. Guy Rathbone was dignified and unobtrusive."

The costumes, scenery and music were admirable. Of Mr. Sime, who designed the costumes, the Academy of December 23 said: "Mr. Sime . . . is perhaps the greatest living authority on ancient Norway, and has made a special study of the period of 'The Pretenders', which ensures that the grouping, dresses and colouring will be historically correct."

The latest Ibsen production of any importance in England has been "Ghosts". After twenty-three years, the Censor's ban on "Ghosts" was removed by the Lord Chamberlain. All this time Mr. J. T. Grein had been working continuously for this end. The first public performance of "Ghosts" in England was a single matinee at the Haymarket Theatre on Tuesday, July 14, 1914, under the direction of Mr. Grein. The cast consisted of Miss Bessie Hatton, Mr. Quartermaine, Mr. J. Fisher White, Mr. Stacy Aumonier, and Miss Dorothy Drake. To quote the Times of July 15: "Mr. Leon Quartermaine's performance as the disease-ridden, dread-haunted boy was a remarkable achievement, full of tragic impotent suggestion both in speech and gesture. Mr. Fisher White as the frank and dogmatic pastor evoked almost the only laugh of the afternoon, and played with fine and sympathetic art; Mr. Stacy Aumonier was still a little inclined to over-emphasize the hypocritical scheming of Engstrand, but in all other respects was in admirable contrast to the general tensity, and Miss Dorothy Drake gave a skillful rendering of the full-blooded Regina. Miss Bessie Hatton played the tragic part of the mother with fine restraint, sweetness and power, fully on a level with the rest of the company. . . . Mr. Grein, in return-

ing thanks for the reception of the piece, read a telegram from Christiania conveying the best wishes of the King and Queen of Norway, under whose patronage it was given, both to the play and to the players."

The history of Ibsen dramas on the English stage has been a series of fights against tremendous odds. In spite of an actively hostile press, an apathetic public, an unsympathetic theatrical world, a few undaunted enthusiasts managed to give Ibsen a trial on the English stage.

The theatrical profession looked on Ibsen with suspicion. Managers dared not risk financial failure by presenting his plays. Actors dared not risk personal unpopularity by allying themselves with his cause. In some cases, actors who took part in Ibsen plays did so with reluctance, as, for example, Mr. Louis Calvert, who expressed himself as having no enthusiasm for Ibsen, since the dramatist "tends to diminish the public stock of harmless pleasure." But little by little there gathered together a group of actors and actresses who gave themselves up to the work with high courage and kindling enthusiasm. Miss Elizabeth Robins, Miss Marion Lea, Mr. Charrington and his wife Miss Janet Achurch, Mr. Waring, and some few others were ready to sacrifice much and endure much that Ibsen might find a place on the English stage. Of the popular English stage favorites, Mrs. Patrick Campbell and Mr. Tree alone allied themselves with Ibsen, though Miss Terry took a week's excursion into Ibsen saga drama.

With no theatrical powers backing Mr. Archer, Mr. Grein, Mr. Charrington, and the other devotees of Ibsen drama, the plays seldom could get an entirely adequate

hearing. Ibsen appeared at afternoon performances, at the end of the season when there was nothing to be gained or lost, at second-rate theatres in out of the way places. The Academy of March 23, 1901, describes the typical Ibsen performance: "Who does not know the forlorn and furtive enterprises undertaken at 'unlucky' theatres, with afternoon sunlight coming in through the side windows, at which Ibsen's masterpieces have been exposed to the adoration of the few and the laughter of the many. These must remain among the bitterest memories of all who care for dramatic art, only less shameful, less insulting to the artist, than the present utilization of the same plays to beguile the Sunday night tedium of the theatrical world."

Lack of funds made it impossible to give Ibsen's dramas their proper stage mounting. Shaw, in the Saturday Review of May 8, 1897, vividly describes the setting of "John Gabriel Borkman": "The first performance of 'John Gabriel Borkman', the latest masterpiece of the acknowledged chief of European dramatic art, has taken place in London under the usual shabby circumstances. For the first scene in the gloomy Borkman house, a faded, soiled, dusty wreck of some gay French salon, originally designed, perhaps, for Offenbach's 'Favart', was fitted with an incongruous Norwegian stove, a painted stair case, and a couple of chairs which were no doubt white and gold when they first figured in Tom Taylor's 'Plot and Passion' or some other relic of the days before Mr. Bancroft revolutionized stage furniture, but have apparently languished ever since, unsold and unsaleable among second-hand keys, framed lithographs of the

Prince Consort, casual fire-irons and stair-rods, and other spoils of the broker. Still, the scene at least was describable, and even stimulative—to irony. In Act II, the gallery in which Borkman prowls for eight years like a wolf was no gallery at all, but a square box ugly to loathsomeness, and too destructive to the imagination and descriptive faculty to incur the penalty of criticism. In Act III (requiring, it will be remembered, the shifting landscape from 'Parsifal') two new cloths specially painted, and good enough to produce a tolerable illusion of snowy pine-wood and midnight mountain with proper accessories, were made ridiculous by a bare acre of wooden floor and only one set of wings for the two. When I looked at that, and thought of the eminence of the author and the greatness of his work, I felt ashamed."

But in spite of these handicaps there was a handful of enthusiasts who fought the battle through to the end. Before audiences composed of a few devotees, hostile critics, and curious neutrals attracted by the scandal that clung to Ibsen drama, they doggedly presented the plays. "Catalina" and "The Feast of Solhoug" are youthful works that do not merit stage production. "Love's Comedy" is a "talky" play, too lacking in action to be successful on the stage. The double play, "Emperor and Galilean" is not adapted to stage presentation. But, outside of these four plays, every one of Ibsen's acknowledged plays gained a place on the English stage, and in addition the English public saw "Olaf Liliekrans" and "The Hero's Mound". Of these twenty Ibsen plays presented to a London audience, some had only one or two performances, only a very few had runs of any length, but Tree's

production of "An Enemy of the People" was revived again and again for years, and "A Doll's House" was seen in at least twelve different productions. And practically every one of these twenty plays received adequate acting, for the actors who supported Ibsen included some of the most capable on the English stage.

In spite of its indifference, in spite of its hostility, England saw the Ibsen plays, and saw them well acted. And though the dramas themselves had little popularity, they have left their mark indelibly on the English stage.

V.

PARODIES AND SEQUELS TO IBSEN DRAMAS

IT MUST have been a great temptation to contemporary parodists to burlesque the dramas of Ibsen. He was the most talked of man of letters in the England of the early nineties. He was the source of one of the liveliest journalistic controversies that the Englishman of that day had known. The very newness of his matter and style, his striking mannerisms, these made him easy to caricature. And, above all, what self respecting parodist could resist the temptation to shock the more pious Ibsenites who, with bated breath, discussed the teachings and meanings of the master?

The English parodies of Ibsen were written during a period of only a few years. Before 1891, Ibsen was still a vague and shadowy figure, represented on the stage only by "A Doll's House" and "Pillars of Society". But in 1891 there appeared on the London stage "Rosmersholm", "Pillars of Society", "Hedda Gabler", "The Lady from the Sea", and that most abused of all Ibsen dramas, "Ghosts". By the end of 1891 Ibsen was a name known to every reader of a London newspaper.

In 1895, the English public had become resigned to Ibsen. He still provoked controversy in the theatrical journals, but he had lost his charm for the daily newspaper. He was no longer an absorbing topic of conversation,

and the parodists lost interest in him. The Ibsen burlesque flourished, therefore, between 1891 and 1895.

W. D. Adams in his "A Book of Burlesque", mentions as the first English parodies of Ibsen two travesties, by Mr. J. P. Hurst and by Mr. Wilton Jones. These were never acted.

The first acted burlesque was "A Pair of Ghosts—(after Ibsen)", by Campbell Rae Brown. This was a duologue in two scenes acted in Steinway Hall on April 16, 1891. A popular actress of burlesque, Miss Rose Henney, appeared as the leading lady.

Far more clever was "Ibsen's Ghost, or Toole up to Date", an early work of the dramatist J. M. Barrie. This burlesque was first performed on May 30, 1891, at Toole's Theatre. It purported to be the fifth act of "Hedda Gabler", which had been performed in London a few weeks before. This "New Hedda" was in one act. The cast included:

George Tesman, an artist.....	Mr. G. Shelton
Thea Tesman (his wife for the present)	
	Miss Irene Vanbrugh
Peter Terence (her grandpapa).....	Mr. J. L. Toole
Della Terence (Peter's Doll).....	Miss Eliza Johnstone

The inimitable Mr. Toole was cleverly made up as Ibsen. Thea, formerly so innocent in her platonic love, is now wedded to Tesman, but she feels she must leave him, for she cannot control her propensity for kissing every man she meets. As she tells her grandfather the story, he explains "Ghosts! Ghosts!" and tells her it is due to heredity. On his wedding day he kissed a pretty bridesmaid, and so he has handed down to her the un-

fortunate tendency. Finally Ibsen is scolded by his various characters and is held responsible for their aberrations until, overcome by remorse, he joins in the general suicide to which Ibsen characters are prone. The play is clever, and without any offence. It was a success and had a long run.

In June, 1891, Robert Buchanan sought to ridicule Ibsen and other "emancipating" agencies in a three act satire. "Heredity", or "The Gifted Lady", as the play was later called, was performed at the Avenue Theatre. The Athenaeum of June 6, 1891, said of this burlesque that—"the play can only be regarded as a mistake. It is too long for a joke, too extravagant for a drama, too depressing for a farce."

Cyril Maude appeared at the Criterion on June 28, 1892, in "A Ghost, a spirited sketch not by Ibsen". It is not a satire on Ibsen, though that claim has been made.

The next Ibsen parody was "Jerry-Builder Solness" by Mrs. Hugh Bell, first performed at St. George's Hall on July 8, 1893.

Solness.....	Mr. James Welch
Dr. Herdal.....	Mr. Wyes
Brovik.....	Mr. O. Barnett
Ragnar Brovik.....	Mr. G. Humphrey
Mrs. Solness.....	Mrs. Edmund Phelps
Kaia.....	Miss Alice Kingsley
Hilda Wangel.....	Miss Violet Vanbrugh

The actors copied the original players, Mr. Waring, Miss Robins, etc., in make-up and costumes. The story deals with a jerry-builder, Solness, who is afraid to venture higher than the first floor in any house that he has built. The play was very ingenious and rather clever.

"Threepenny Bits", a one-act burlesque on Ibsen by Mr. Israel Zangwill, was produced for charity at the Garrick Theatre on May 6, 1895. Miss Violet Vanbrugh and Mr. Arthur Bouchier took the main parts. The play is characterized by rather grim pleasantry.

By far the cleverest Ibsen parodies are those by Thomas Anstey Guthrie ("F. Anstey") originally published in the pages of *Punch* and issued in book form in 1893. Among the absurdly funny illustrations by Bernard Partridge is a fine portrait of Ibsen as Mr. Punch.

The book is entitled "Mr. Punch's Pocket Ibsen: a collection of some of the master's best-known dramas, condensed, revised, and slightly rearranged for the benefit of the earnest student." In a Prefatory Note, Mr. Punch announces that "the concluding piece, 'Pill-doctor Herdal' is, as the observant reader will instantly perceive, rather a reverent attempt to tread in the footprints of the Norwegian dramatist, than a version of any actually existing masterpiece."

The first play is "Rosmersholm". The burlesque follows the play exactly, stressing Rebecca's frequent confessions. Finally Rosmer announces: "I want to recover faith in my mission, in my power to enoble human souls. And, as a logical thinker, this I cannot do now, unless—well, unless you jump into the mill-race, too, like Beata." So Rebecca packs up her belongings and hand in hand she and Rosmer leave for the mill-race. They soon come back, however, as the White Horse is on the bridge, and postpone their suicide to a time when the Horse will not be in their way.

In "Nora, or the Bird-Cage" ("Et dikkisvoet") we have

the same type of parody. Here again the play is followed scene for scene. Finally, in the last dialogue, Helmer reproaches poor Nora—"If you *must* forge, you might at least put your dates in correctly! But you never *had* any principle." Then Nora declares, "If I had been properly educated I should have known better than to date poor Papa's signature three days after he died. Now I must educate *myself*." And she decides to start "with a course of the Norwegian theatres. If *that* doesn't take the frivolity out of me, I really don't know what will!" And so she leaves. But in a few minutes she comes back, since she had only threepence-halfpenny and the theatres have closed anyway. She will stay for breakfast. She starts her education by reading the dictionary. Torvald humbly offers her a macaroon. She repulses it, but eventually succumbs.

In "Hedda Gabler", Thea enters with the explanation: "Eilert Lövborg, you know, who was our tutor; he's written such a large new book. I inspired him. Oh, I know I don't look like it, but I did—he told me so. And, good gracious, now he's in this dangerous, wicked town all alone, and he's a reformed character, and I'm so frightened about him; so, as the wife of a sheriff twenty years older than me, I came up to look after Mr. Lövborg. Do ask him here—then I can meet him. You will? How perfectly lovely of you. My husband's so fond of him!" "Hedda Gabler" is the tragedy of old General Gabler's pistols that just will not shoot straight. That is why Eilert makes such a sad mess of things. In the end, Hedda goes into the next room to commit suicide. But the shots

go wild. The first kills George, the second Thea, and the third Judge Brack; so Hedda decides to live.

In "The Wild Duck", Gregers Werle decides: "I shall take my hat and inform him that his home is built upon a lie. He will be *so* much obliged to me!" But Hialmar is not, and becomes sulky. Finally Gregers tries to persuade Hedvig to shoot the duck.

GREGERS: Ah, I see you haven't found courage to settle the Wild Duck yet!

HEDVIG: No—it seemed such a delightful idea at first. Now it strikes me as a trifle—well, Ibsenish.

But she consents, and is interrupted only by Gina, who cries: "But don't you see. It's the pigstol—that fatal Norwegian weapon which, in Ibsenian dramas, *never* shoots straight!" The pistol is taken from Hedvig, and the play ends happily. But Gregers is vexed: "It's all very pretty, I dare say—but it's not Ibsen." And he goes in annoyance.

The best burlesque is "Pill-doctor Herdal", a delightful satire on the "Master Builder". This play is a sequel rather than a rewriting of Ibsen's drama. Dr. Herdal has married the widowed Mrs. Solness. There is a pretty book-keeper, whose worth consists in her ability to charge three times for each of the doctor's visits, and her lover, whose pills Dr. Herdal will not acknowledge. He discharges the book-keeper and hires a new one, a man. Dr. Herdal made his fortune by giving a pill to his predecessor. The predecessor did not take the pill, but the doctor is haunted by doubts. Hilda comes. She tells her adventures. She spent some time with Kaia and Ragnar

Brovik. She inspired him to build houses with steeples. Of course no one bought them, so Ragnar went bankrupt, and Hilda left. She met Mr. Tesman and his wife Thea. She helped Mr. Tesman with his book. Poor Thea wasn't very strong-minded anyway, so she went mad with jealousy, and George shot himself with his former father-in-law's pistol. Then Hilda went to Rosmersholm where she met Rector Kroll. She persuaded him to ride on the White Horse, but, since he had never ridden before, he fell off into the mill-race and was drowned. Now Hilda says that she has heard that Dr. Herdal is afraid to swallow his own pills, so she persuades him to make a beautiful powder of poisons, and eat it. He finally consents. But the new book-keeper has put chalk into all the poison jars, so Dr. Herdal is saved. The book-keeper then reveals himself. He is Torvald Helmer. He turns to Hilda and addresses her as Nora. Yes, she is Nora, and she has been visiting around in order to complete her education. Since this is done, she leaves with Torvald.

Anstey's method is to emphasize the improbabilities in Ibsen to the point of absurdity, and to stress all the melodramatic situations. The satire throughout the book is delightfully funny and entirely good-natured.

Wherever "A Doll's House" was presented, there always followed violent discussion as to whether or not Nora returned to Torvald. Sir Walter Besant, in a story "The Doll's House—and After", in the English Illustrated Magazine of January, 1890, seriously attempted to show the results of Nora's desertion of her family. In this story Nora has become a wealthy lady novelist and

travels continually. Torvald has become a helpless drunkard. Einar, too, drinks; Bob has inherited from his mother a tendency to forge; Emmy takes in sewing and supports the family. Krogstad has become Mayor of the town, and is the leader in all philanthropic endeavors. It is to his young son that Emmy becomes engaged to be married. Nora returns to town and Mrs. Linden-Krogstad goes to her in disguise to urge her to interest herself in her family. But Nora coldly retorts, "You speak of unknown people—strangers. The sins of strange people are only interesting as forming data in the general problems of humanity." However, Nora relents sufficiently to go to Emmy in disguise, but is repelled by Emmy's hatred of the mother who is the cause of so much woe. Bob forges a note. The good kind Mayor Krogstad comes to Emmy to break off the match with his son. He gently blackmails her, threatening to prosecute Bob if Emmy will not give up his son. Emmy succumbs, and decides on suicide. The story ends with Nora, in a satin gown, riding to the station, and haughtily complaining because the men bearing the drowned body of her daughter block her carriage.

This delightful absurdity was written in all seriousness and with great indignation, in order to prove Ibsen's wickedness in advocating Nora's actions.

Bernard Shaw and Mrs. Marx-Aveling both wrote sequels to this sequel.

Ednah Dow Cheney published in Boston a sequel to "The Doll's House" called "Nora's Return". This was directly in answer to Besant. In this novel, written in diary form, Nora finds her true self by becoming a nurse.

In a cholera epidemic she nurses Helmer and saves his life. They are reconciled, and the story ends with a happy domestic scene.

In 1891, Austin Fryers published in London "Rosmer of Rosmersholm", giving in dramatic form the events that led up to Ibsen's play. As "Beata", the play was presented for a series of matinees at the Globe Theatre on April 19, 1892.

Beata.....	Miss Florence Ivor
Rebecca West.....	Miss Estelle Burney
Madame Helseth.....	Miss Susie Vaughan
Rector Kroll.....	Mr. Henry Vernon
Mortensgard.....	Mr. George Hughes
Dr. West.....	Mr. Robert Soutar
Rosmer.....	Mr. Leonard Outram

The play is described as fairly good, but very morbid. The acting was evidently remarkably fine.

These parodies and sequels to Ibsen's plays, intrinsically unimportant, are yet indications of the widespread interest in Ibsen in England. A dramatist must be almost universally known before he can be parodied with popular success. And a sequel is of little interest, if the play which it supplements is not known to everyone.

VI.

IBSEN'S INFLUENCE ON ENGLISH DRAMA

THE END of the nineteenth century found the English theatre ready for new ideas, new situations, new dramatic forms. The drama had been passing through a period of conscious experiment, always working towards new technique and new subject matter. Sheridan Knowles, Sergeant Talfourd, Bulwer-Lytton, and W. G. Wills had tried to revive the romantic tradition and had failed. They had gained a considerable temporary success, but their plays died with them. Browning and Tennyson had put poetry on the stage, but "Becket" and "A Blot on the 'Scutcheon'" lacked sufficient dramatic vitality to hold the boards. The melodramas of G. R. Sims, Paul Merritt, and Henry Pettitt gained enormous popularity, but not even these clever playwrights themselves claimed for their works any literary or dramatic merit. Planché and his host of imitators wrote delicate and witty extravaganzas, but such airy trifles could not satisfy a public eager for a vital and virile drama.

Then came the years of transition. Boucicault, Tom Taylor and Charles Reade were essentially sentimentalists, yet they were touched by a new spirit of realism. They were vaguely conscious of a new atmosphere, a freshening breeze that sought to sweep away the old musty unrealities, and to substitute actualities for pleasant deceptions. Thomas Robertson above all realized the

trend of the times, and his watchword, "probable people in possible situations" led the way to a new realism and a new dramatic truth. Gilbert picked up the burlesque where Planché had left it, and by infusing a keen reality throughout the topsy-turvydom of his delightful world, made art out of this step-child of the drama. Grundy, by his appreciative adaptations and imitations of French plays, brought into England carefully diluted continental realism. But even this disguised realism was a bit too strong for a public accustomed to Robertson, and Grundy never attained the success that his skill and foresight merited.

The movement was progressing slowly, but the tendency was unmistakably present. Boucicault's Irish peasant folks, the daring of Robertson's mid-Victorian bohemianism, Gilbert's realistic satire, Grundy's French adaptations, all of these indicated the trend of the English theatre. It was a formative period, needing only a strong and vivid personality to direct it definitely into realism.

In 1879, in the Nineteenth Century, Matthew Arnold wrote: "We are at the end of a period, and have to deal with the facts and symptoms of a new period on which we are entering; and prominent among these fresh facts and symptoms is the irresistibility of the theatre. . . . What is certain is that a signal change is coming over us, and that it has already made great progress. . . . The attraction of the theatre begins to be felt again, after a long interval of insensibility. . . . I see our community turning to the theatre with eagerness and finding the English theatre without organization, or purpose, or

dignity, and no modern English drama at all except a fantastical one. . . . The theatre is irresistible; organize the theatre."

Ten years later "A Doll's House" shocked out of its apathy the English theatrical world, and discerning critics knew that the needed strong and vivid influence had been found.

Ibsen was not a freak or sport who, in a world of theatrical unrealities, first saw the truth and presented it to a waiting public. He was essentially the child of his times, undoubtedly influenced by the French and German dramatists who preceded him, Hebbel and Becque and Scribe. Ibsen never claimed for himself the position of prophet of realism. He felt the trend towards actuality that marked the literature of his day and, because he was the greatest dramatist of his age, expressed this realism more vividly than could his contemporaries. In a speech to students on his first return to Norway, Ibsen disclaimed any gift of prophecy: "All that I have written in the last ten years I have experienced in spirit. But no poet has isolated experiences; he has rather only those that his contemporaries share with him. For were this not the case, how should there be a bridge between the intelligence of the giver and of the receiver?"

The modern movement towards realism that swept over the English theatre at the end of the nineteenth century was paralleled in nearly every European country. It cannot be traced to any single political event, any single social condition, any current in philosophy, any one writer. A movement in our modern complex civilization is necessarily a result of complex causes. Ibsen was un-

doubtedly the greatest personal factor in the movement, but his work consisted in putting into dramatic form thoughts and ideas that already had exponents and advocates. His influence was due not to an original philosophy, but to the magnificent art and compelling power that clothed existing ideas in a form that could not be ignored, could not be swept aside, could not be forgotten. English drama had vaguely groped towards these ideas, but it needed a strong man to lead the way, and Ibsen became that leader.

With the impulse towards realism, the English theatre gained that consciousness of power that Arnold had urged. Dramatists tried no longer merely to amuse; they knew that their art demanded that they hold the mirror up to nature and show the world the truth. Drama once more became a self-respecting art. The eighteen-nineties was a busy decade. Theatrical criticism gained a new influence. Even the newspapers opened their columns to discussions of drama. The right of censorship was hotly contested. Men talked of a national theatre. The stage became a forum in which ideas were debated. The drama realized its social responsibility. And over all this healthy activity, there was the ever-present spirit of dramatic realism, for English playwrights were beginning to follow where Ibsen had led the way.

English dramatists saw in Ibsen primarily the iconoclast. Ibsen's influence was, to a large extent, a destructive one. He was a dramatic reformer who ventilated the theatre with draughts of fresh thought. He swept from the stage the false sentimentality and moral shams that

had reigned there. He emancipated the theatre from the thralldom of convention.

Above all, Ibsen brought realism to the English stage. His characters were living men and women. He included in his dramatis personæ no stage hero, no perfect heroine, no absolute villain. Since such people are seldom found in life, they have no place in a drama that seeks to portray life. Ibsen's characters were always individualized. They were never merely typical.

Ibsen was the first great dramatic mouthpiece of the middle class. He paid little attention to the extremes of the social scale, the peasant in his struggle with poverty, and the noble leading a life of artificiality. He preferred rather to treat of the great mean, the middle class to which he and all of his readers belonged. Rosmer had behind him the traditions of the lesser nobility, Hedda was the daughter of a general, Gina was a domestic servant, yet these characters, along with the rest of Ibsen's people, were primarily of the middle class. No one can doubt that tragedy is found in the three-story brick house around the corner, as poignant as any enacted in castle or peasant's hovel; yet Ibsen was the first to portray the tragedies in the lives of suburban, provincial people. He took themes hitherto treated epically, and showed these themes working out in narrow, unheroic, middle-class families.

Ibsen flashed on his bourgeois people the brilliance of his insight, and it was this that made them fascinating characters. Never had modern dramatist shown a more masterly analysis of human nature. Each character had a reality that was startling.

There are few writers who dare combine realism with poetry and symbolism, and Ibsen is one of these few. At times he was unsuccessful, allowing his symbolism to steal from his characters their air of reality, but usually he was able to perform the feat, and produce a play that pictured actual life, yet hid a symbolic meaning.

Equally difficult is the task of writing a drama of ideas in which realism shall not suffer. The majority of Ibsen's imitators have never been able to parallel his success in this direction. "The Wild Duck" was an intellectual drama built around a definite idea, yet Gregers Werle, Gina, Hialmar, Relling, Hedwig, Old Ekdal were living people in convincingly real situations.

Ibsen never preached sermons, but in almost every play there was a definite idea, a point of view on social ethics. Society was behind all of Ibsen's people. They could not isolate themselves from the world in which they lived. Nora, Oswald, Stockmann, individual as they were, were not unique in their sufferings. The modern social drama was born with Ibsen.

The doctrine of heredity was by no means an idea original with Ibsen, but his use of that motive was new to the stage. His insistence on the terrible potency of heredity left an ineffaceable impression on European thought.

It was perhaps Ibsen's technique that had the most immediate influence on English drama. As can be seen from "The League of Youth", Ibsen began by taking over the machinery of Scribe and the younger Dumas, but he made it run more smoothly. As he progressed in his art, his stage contracted and he approached observance

of the unities. But always his play was an organic whole.

Ibsen's most striking effect was obtained by his new use of exposition. Ibsen broke away from the romantic tradition and followed Greek art, in his omission of the first few acts of every play. His play included only the fifth act catastrophe, or at most the climax and catastrophe. All the earlier events in the story had to appear in exposition. At first, as in Nora's confession to Mrs. Linden, the exposition seemed a bit strained. But later, as in "Rosmersholm" and "Little Eyolf" the exposition had a terrific dramatic force. Gradually the facts in the case were unfolded, until the play became what Huntley Carter terms "an unbroken crescendo of enlightenment."

There was little physical action in an Ibsen play. Whatever conflict there might be was a conflict of wills. Ibsen illumined the motives, laid bare the souls of his characters, but all this was done without action. The tarantelle and the letter-box episode were interesting, but the real drama came when Nora quietly faced Helmer across the table and dispassionately discussed her situation.

Since he eliminated action as an important dramatic weapon, Ibsen had to rely almost entirely on dialogue. Here he showed amazing power. His dialogue was simple, broken, fragmentary, the natural speech of real life. It was pregnant with meaning, veiling deep underlying thoughts and emotions. No speech could be omitted without a loss, for each word revealed a character, hinted at some hidden emotion, or laid bare a significant event of the past. Even in translation the dialogue was a revelation of dramatic perfection.

Ibsen's dialogue revealed all that he wished his audience to know. He did not find it necessary to employ soliloquies and asides in order to make clear his meaning. An aside in Ibsen's plays is absolutely unknown. Short soliloquies, as when Hedda burns Eilert's manuscript, were used only where in actual life a person of that character in such a situation would be likely to mutter aloud. As early as 1869, Ibsen wrote to Georg Brandes, of the "League of Youth": "I have paid particular attention to the form and among other things I have accomplished the feat of doing without a single monologue—in fact, without a single aside."

Daring was Ibsen's use of dramatic secrets. It had always been a hard and fast rule that playwrights must not keep a secret from the audience. Though no one in the cast knew certain events, the audience understood them all. Ibsen, more realistic, put his audience in the position of spectators of life, from whom secrets are commonly kept. To quote Montague's "Dramatic Opinions": "To the scandal of comfortable, settled minds, Ibsen kept secrets of incident from his audience; secrets of character, too—a sin, some thought, deadlier still. Cardinal facts, like the manner of Beata's death in "Rosmersholm", on which all hinged, were only let out towards the end of his plays. Torvald Helmer and Consul Bernick were introduced in apparent good faith as worthy men and brothers, only to be gradually exposed as subtly whited sepulchres."

Ibsen had a keen sense of climax, perhaps one of his most valuable technical assets. His gradual revealing of secrets invariably produced climaxes of the most striking

kind. Equally impressive were the vivid endings of Ibsen's plays. No one who had seen or read "Ghosts" could forget the force of the ending. Unforgettable, too, was Judge Brack's bewildered speech that closed "Hedda Gabler" and Madame Helseth's horror at the catastrophe of "Rosmersholm". There was no anti-climax in an Ibsen drama. Technically, every play moved steadily upwards, and held the interest of the audience until the final curtain.

Ibsen's popularity was spread largely by means of the printed play. Gilbert, Pinero, Jones and Grundy had all published their dramas, but it was not until the vogue of the English translations of Ibsen that the printed play gained any great circle of readers. Ibsen's plays really established in England the custom of publishing and reading plays. The interest of the reading public in the Norwegian dramatist encouraged Pinero, Jones, Wilde, Phillips, Galsworthy, Shaw, and others, to print all their plays. Indeed, Shaw's reputation was made through the printed page.

The universal publishing of plays necessitated a change in stage directions. In their early plays, Pinero, Jones and Grundy used the old method of indicating action by means of initials L., R., C., etc. Ibsen inaugurated the stage direction addressed to the reader rather than merely to actors. Descriptions of characters, vivid sketches of the settings, brilliant side-lights on the situations, added enormously to the interest of Ibsen's dramas.

To summarize briefly, Ibsen brought to the English stage a spirit of iconoclasm, the use of realism, symbolism, the drama of social ideas, and an unexcelled technique.

As was inevitable, his iconoclasm, realism, symbolism, social sense, and technique influenced English drama profoundly. This influence was recognized almost from the first. In January, 1892, less than three years after the Novelty Theatre performance of "A Doll's House", Justin McCarthy wrote in the *Gentleman's Magazine*: "To contest the influence of Ibsen upon this country would be needless. . . . It may be said of Ibsen's influence, as Napoleon said of the French Republic, that it is as obvious as the sun in Heaven, and asks for no recognition." In the Theatre of May 1, 1894, Bettany admitted: "That the great Norwegian has influenced our stage and influenced it profoundly, none but the veriest dolt would deny." The *Athenaeum* of January 5, 1895, wrote: "Those who in fighting the battles of Ibsen are held to be championing a lost cause may derive consolation from the obvious and remarkable influence exercised by the Scandinavian master over our boldest and most energetic playwrights." Malcolm Watson in the Theatre of September 1, 1895, said: "But that Ibsen's influence upon the later work of our more thoughtful playwrights may be distinctly traced it would be idle to deny." In the *Critic* of 1901, Walkley declared that there was no serious drama produced in London that was not judged on all hands, overtly or tacitly, by reference to Ibsen's ideas and Ibsen's technique. "He is like Napoleon in 'L'Aiglon', who is absent in the flesh, but still posthumously, troubles the world as the Napoleonic idea."

English dramatists were by no means anxious to admit their debt, however. Pinero at first denied any actual study of Ibsen's methods, but admitted the possibility of

unconscious borrowings. Grundy vehemently denied any imitation of Ibsen's matter or manner. In 1894 Bettany wrote in his Ibsen article: "Mr. Jones is the only one of our prominent playwrights who has manifestly fallen under the Master's spell." Yet few critics were more violently anti-Ibsen than Jones. The prologue to Jones' "The Tempter", 1893, read in part:

"Shun the crude present with vain problems rife,
Nor join the bleak Norwegian's barren quest
For deathless beauty's self and holy zest
Of rapturous martyrdom, in some base strife
Of petty dullards, soused in native filth."

In "The Renaissance of the English Drama", published in 1895, Jones wrote: "A strong dirty man has written plays, and now every feeble dirty person thinks himself a dramatist." Very consistently Jones disclaimed any influence of Ibsen, though his plays with equal consistency indicated otherwise.

It is only fair to Mr. Jones to acknowledge his confession of his error in "Foundations of a National Drama", printed in 1913. "A test of Ibsen's quality is supplied by the characters of the men who have most hated and vilified him. Some tribute may perhaps be offered, belated, but I hope not too late, by those whom his tense and shattering genius has at length conquered and brought to own with great regret that they have in part misjudged, in part underestimated him." And, in the same volume: "No glance at any corner of the modern drama can leave out of sight the ominous figure of Ibsen. A great destroyer; a great creator; a great poet; a great liberator; in his later prose plays he has freed the

European drama, not only from the minor conventions of the stage, such as the perfunctory aside and the perfunctory soliloquy, but from the deadlier bondage of sentimentality, of one-eyed optimism and sham morality. As there is no modern playwright who understands his craft that does not pay homage to Ibsen's technique, so there is no serious modern dramatist who has not been directly or indirectly influenced by him, and whose path has not been made clearer, and straighter, and easier by Ibsen's matchless veracity, courage and sincerity."

It would be folly to attempt to list all the English plays that show traces of Ibsen's influence. A discussion of the influence of one writer on another is invariably a matter of personal opinion. It is easy to ascribe every chance similarity to influence, or, on the other hand, it is equally easy to ascribe to coincidence every characteristic shared in common. To arrive at the truth of a matter so subtle is practically impossible.

In the case of Ibsen's influence on English writers, however, there are certain irrefutable facts. The drama before 1890 was very different from the drama that came after that year, and contemporary critics attributed the change largely to Ibsen. Moreover, certain playwrights, whose dramas show similarities to Ibsen's, frankly admit their indebtedness.

Of the more prominent English dramatists, Pinero, Jones, Shaw and Galsworthy seem to show most plainly the influence of Ibsen. Grundy reveals careful observance of the Norwegian dramatist in but a single play, "The Greatest of These". Wilde tried to graft on to his French technique a few of the new tricks of exposition,

but only one play, "An Ideal Husband", shows any marked result of his study of Ibsen. Barker is an essentially original playwright. With the exception of the Ibsenesque "The Voysey Inheritance", Barker shows little trace of having been influenced by any dramatist.

In Pinero we see most plainly the conventional English dramatist lifted out of the old rut by the transfiguring power of Ibsen. Pinero was keen to recognize Ibsen's power, eager in his admiration, and yet cautious in his imitation. He studied Ibsen carefully, picking out certain characteristics that could be closely imitated, noting others that could be used sparingly, discarding others that could never make an appeal to the English public. Always the popular dramatist, Pinero knew exactly when to time his blow. Pinero's plays all show a compromise between noteworthy ability and a sincere desire to create a work of art on the one hand, and the necessity of pleasing the public on the other.

Ibsen's influence shows most plainly in "The Profligate", 1889, "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray", 1893, "The Notorious Mrs. Ebbsmith", 1895, "The Benefit of the Doubt", 1895, "Iris", 1901, "His House in Order", 1906, "The Thunderbolt", 1908, and "Midchannel", 1909.

On the whole, "The Profligate" is modelled closely after the well-made play of Dumas fils. But it is noteworthy that as early as 1889, there seems to be in this play a new note, a social conscience, an effort to portray motivation, that suggests the influence of Ibsen. By 1893 there was no longer any doubt as to the identity of Pinero's dramatic master. "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" shows unmistakably his indebtedness to Ibsen. In

the Theatre of October 1, 1894, Herbert Waring said of Pinero's play: "It is impossible to see or read the play without feeling that the English dramatist has, unconsciously or voluntarily, recognized to a certain extent the value of the Ibsen method." Pinero had always been guilty of too much embellishment of style, too great a tendency to indulge in metaphorical speech. Here in "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray" there is evident for the first time a designedly simple and natural dialogue. "The Profligate" had abounded in soliloquies, but these disappeared from the latter play. Above all, the influence of Ibsen can be seen in the masterly way in which Pinero tells his story backwards. The exposition throughout is remarkably well handled. Particularly fine is the natural manner in which the opening scene reveals past events and strikes the social keynote of the play. Paula is in many ways reminiscent of Hedda Gabler; and very similar is the boredom in quiet domesticity, and the pathetic hopelessness that precedes the suicide of both heroines. The heredity motif, stressed so often in Ibsen, is very subtly handled in the fatal resemblance in temperament between Ellean and Tanqueray's first wife. Again and again throughout Pinero's play there are situations, speeches and methods of handling material that are undoubtedly ultimately traceable to Ibsen.

The remaining six plays mentioned above all show unmistakable signs of the influence of Ibsen's technique. The masterly exposition in "The Thunderbolt" and "Mid-channel", the closely woven texture of "The Thunderbolt", the economy of material in "Iris", all point to Ibsen. From the Norwegian, too, comes the art that makes real

the middle class life of "The Benefit of the Doubt" and "The Thunderbolt". Agnes Ebbsmith resembles in many ways Rebecca West; Iris and Zoe exemplify two differing characteristics of Hedda. "The Notorious Mrs. Ebbsmith" is full of situations that tantalize in their vague suggestion of Ibsen, as the burning of the Bible, calling up the picture of Hedda kneeling at the fireplace, and Mrs. Thorne's strange fancies about her dead boy, recalling the Agnes of "Brand" and the candle to light home her child.

Jones wrote no play as Ibsenesque as Pinero's "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray". Yet Ibsen's influence is plainly present, particularly in "Saints and Sinners", 1884, "Judah", 1890, "The Crusaders", 1891, "Michael and His Lost Angel", 1896, "Mrs. Dane's Defence", 1900, and "The Hypocrites", 1906.

The question of Ibsen's influence on "Saints and Sinners" is a peculiar one. Jones' play, written in 1884, is usually declared to be influenced by "Pillars of Society", since it bears a striking resemblance to that play in its setting and in its attack on respectable social institutions. Yet in 1884 Ibsen's play had not yet been printed in English translation, and had been presented on the English stage only once, in 1880. If Mr. Jones was in the audience on that memorable December afternoon, there is undoubtedly an Ibsen influence on his play; if he was not present, a remarkable similarity is due merely to coincidence.

Jones shows the influence of Ibsen in both thought and technique, though in the latter he never approaches Ibsen as closely as does Pinero. For instance, in "Michael

which he provoked in Europe. But there is more. In England—"Ibsen became a bogey to many worthy people who had never read or seen a single one of his plays. . . . Ibsenism was supposed vaguely to connote 'Women's Rights', 'Free Love', 'Norwegian Socialism', etc." This, Walkley explained, was because Ibsen was taken up by cranks. "After 'A Doll's House', the Women's Righters, mistaking the artist for a propagandist, were riotous Ibsenites, and (judging from a certain brilliantly mis-leading opusculé by Mr. Bernard Shaw) I fancy that for a moment the Socialists were under the quaint delusion that they had found a new prophet."

Ibsen probably failed to gain success on the English stage because of the Puritan influence on the audience, and the resulting inability of the theatre-goer to see in the stage anything but an evening's amusement, because of his "suburbanism", because his drama was that of a foreigner, because his plays were not adapted to the long run system, because of the unpopularity of his supporters and the power of his opponents, because the theatrical controversy pitted against him all conservatives, and because he was presented as the propagandist of movements unpopular in England.

Though Ibsen's supporters made occasional mistakes, on the whole they did the Norwegian dramatist excellent service. They translated his plays and gave them stage presentation, they interpreted him sympathetically, and, through their controversies, they made him known throughout England. They accomplished their ends, for though Ibsen had no great stage success, he has his hosts of readers and is as alive in England to-day as when he was first popularized.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.

ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF IBSEN

1872. "Terje Vigen" in "Norwegian and Swedish Poems" by J. A. D. (Johan Andreas Dahl)—Bergen.
1873. "The Poet's Song" from "Love's Comedy" and "Agnes" from "Brand" in "On Viol and Flute" by Edmund Gosse—Chatto.
1876. "Køjser og Gallæser" as "Emperor and Galilean" by Catherine Ray—S. Tinsley.
- 1876-78. "Terje Vigen", "En fugle vise" (A Bird's Song), "Ederfuglejn" ("Elderduck"), "Cradle Song" from "The Pretenders", and Act I of "Catilina", in "Translations from the Norse, by a B. S. S.", by A. Johnstone—British Society of Scandinavians, Gloucester, private circulation.
1879. Scenes from "Love's Comedy" and "Peer Gynt", and "Agnes" from "Brand", in "Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe" by Edmund Gosse—Kegan Paul.
1880. "Et dukkehjem" as "Nora" by T. Weber—Weber's Academy, Copenhagen.
1882. "Nora" by Henrietta Frances Lord—Griffith, Farran and Company.
1885. "Gengangere" as "Ghosts" by Henrietta Frances Lord—"To-Day", Volume 3.
1888. "Ghosts" by Henrietta Frances Lord—Griffith, Farran and Company—revised from translation in "To-Day".
"Samfundets stotter" ("Pillars of Society") by William Archer, "Ghosts", revised by Archer from Miss Lord's translation, and "En folkefiende" ("An Enemy of Society") by Mrs. Eleanor Marx-Aveling, in "Pillars of Society and Other Plays", edited by Havelock Ellis—Camelot Series, Walter Scott.
1889. "Et dukkehjem" as "A Doll's House" by William Archer—Novelty Theatre Edition, Fisher Unwin.
"Rosmersholm" by Louis Napoleon Parker—Griffith, Farran and Company.
1890. "Fruen fra havet" as "The Lady from the Sea" by Mrs. Eleanor Marx-Aveling—introduction by Gosse—Cameo Series, Fisher Unwin.
"Nora, or A Doll's House" and 'Ghosts', revised by Miss Lord—Griffith Farran and Company.

1890—continued

Poems by Ibsen in "Et Hæroert Mvsebillede" by Henrik Jaeger, 1888; translated by Clara Bell as "Life of Henrik Ibsen"—Heinemann—poems translated by Gosse.

- 1890-91. "Ibsen's Prose Dramas" edited by Archer. Volume 1, biography by Archer, "De unges forbund" (The League of Youth), "Pillars of Society", and "A Doll's House", by Archer. Volume 2, "Ghosts" by Archer, "An Enemy of the People" by Mrs. Marx-Aveling, both reprinted from the Camelot Series volume, and "Vildanden" ("The Wild Duck") by Mrs. F. E. Archer. Volume 3, "Fru Inger til Ostraat" ("Lady Inger of Ostraat") by Charles Archer, "Haermaendene paa Helgeland" ("Vikings at Helgeland") by William Archer, and "Kongs-æmnerne" ("The Pretenders") by William Archer. Volume 4, "Emperor and Galilean" by William Archer. Volume 5, "Rosmersholm" by Charles Archer, "The Lady from the Sea" by Mrs. F. E. Archer, and "Hedda Gabler" by William Archer—Walter Scott.

"The Prose Dramas of Henrik Ibsen", edited by Gosse. Volume 1, biography by Gosse, "A Doll's House", "Pillars of Society" and "Ghosts", by Archer, and "Rosmersholm" by M. Carmichael. The Archer translations are reprints. Volume 2, "The Lady from the Sea" by Clara Bell, "An Enemy of Society" by Archer, "The Wild Duck" by Mrs. Marx-Aveling, and "The Young Men's League" by Henry Carstarphen. Volume 3, "Hedda Gabler" by Archer—John W. Lovell Company, New York and London, numbers 2, 6 and 10 of "Lovell's Series of Foreign Literature."

1891. "Hedda Gabler", Gosse—four editions; cloth edition, Vaudeville edition, edition de luxe, and edition published in Leipzig as number 68 of the English Library, Heinemann and Balestier—Heinemann.

"Hedda Gabler", Archer—reprinted by Scott in Shilling Edition.

"Rosmersholm", Charles Archer—reprinted by Scott in Shilling Edition.

"The Lady from the Sea", by Mrs. Marx-Aveling—facsimile edition by Fisher Unwin.

"Brand" by William Wilson—Methuen and Company.

Poems in "Four Lectures on Ibsen" by P. H. Wicksteed—Swan, Sonnenschein and Company.

1892. "Peer Gynt" by William and Charles Archer—Walter Scott. In appendix, translation of Norse folk tale sources.

"A Doll's House", Archer—reprinted in Shilling Edition by Scott.

"Bygmester Solness" in the Norwegian—Heinemann.

1893. "Bygmester Soiness" ("The Master Builder") by Gosse and Archer—Heinemann.
 "The Master Builder", by Gosse and Archer with "An Appendix for Critics" by Archer—Heinemann.
 "Nora, or A Doll's House", Miss Lord—facsimile edition by Griffith, Farran and Company.
1894. "Brand", William Wilson—second edition by Methuen and Company.
 "Brand in English Verse in the Original Meters", by F. Edmund Garrett—Fisher Unwin.
 "Brand", by Professor Charles Harold Herford—Heinemann. Poems, and portions of "Brand" in "Ibsen Commentary" by Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen—Macmillan, America and England.
1895. "Little Eyolf" ("Little Eyolf"), Archer—Heinemann.
1896. "Peer Gynt, a Dramatic Poem", William and Charles Archer—new edition by Walter Scott.
1897. "John Gabriel Borkman", Archer—Heinemann.
 "John Gabriel Borkman", Archer—popular edition, Heinemann.
 "Little Eyolf", Archer—Avenue Edition, Heinemann.
 "Ghosts", Archer—Shilling Edition, Scott.
 "The Lady from the Sea", Mrs. F. E. Archer—Shilling Edition, Scott.
 "The Wild Duck", Mrs. F. E. Archer—Shilling Edition, Scott.
 "A Doll's House", William Archer—Shilling Edition, Scott.
 "An Enemy of the People", Mrs. Marx-Aveling—Shilling Edition, Scott.
 Selections from Ibsen in "Gleanings from Ibsen", an Ibsen Calendar by Emmie Avery Kiddall and Percy Cross Standing—Stock.
1898. "Hedda Gabler", Gosse—fifth edition by Heinemann.
 "The Master Builder", Gosse and Archer—third edition, Heinemann.
1899. "Peer Gynt", William and Charles Archer—third edition, Scott.
 "Brand", Herford—second edition, Heinemann.
1900. "Kærlighedens komedie" (Love's Comedy), Professor C. H. Herford—Duckworth and Company.
 "Naar vi doede vaagner" ("When We Dead Awaken"), Archer—Heinemann.
 "When We Dead Awaken", Archer—second edition by Heinemann.
- 1900-01. "Prose Dramas of Henrik Ibsen", edited by Archer. Volume 1, revision of "The League of Youth", Archer. Volume 2, revision of "Pillars of Society", Archer. Volume

1900-01—continued

- 3, revision of "A Doll's House", Archer. Volume 4, revision of "Ghosts", Archer. Volume 5, revision of "An Enemy of the People", Mrs. Marx-Aveling—Scott.
1901. "Brand", Herford—third edition by Heinemann.
"The Master Builder", Gosse and Archer—fourth edition, Heinemann.
1902. "Peer Gynt", William and Charles Archer—third reprint by Scott.
"Ibsen's Lyrical Poems", selected and translated by R. A. Streatfield—Mathews.
- 1904-05. "Prose Dramas of Henrik Ibsen", of 1900-01, reprinted by Scott.
1905. "The Wild Duck", Mrs. F. E. Archer, introduction by the editor, Archer—reprint, Scott.
"Ibsen's Letters", John Nilsen Laurvik and Mary Morrison—Hodder and Stoughton.
1906. "The Lady from the Sea", Archer—new edition, Scott.
"Rosmersholm", Archer—new edition, Scott.
"Peer Gynt", William and Charles Archer—new edition, Scott.
"Hedda Gabler", Gosse—Theatre Edition, Heinemann.
"When We Dead Awaken", Archer—Heinemann.
- 1906-08. "The Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen", edited by Archer—Heinemann. Volume 1, 1908, Preface by William Archer; "Lady Inger of Ostrat", introduction by William Archer, translation by Charles Archer; "Gildet paa Solhoug" ("The Feast at Solhoug"), introduction by William Archer, translation by Archer and Mary Morrison; "Love's Comedy", introduction and translation by C. H. Herford. Volume 2, 1906, introductions and translations of "Vikings at Helgeland" and "The Pretenders" by William Archer. Volume 3, 1906, "Brand", introduction and translation by Herford. Volume 4, 1907, "Peer Gynt", William and Charles Archer, introduction by William Archer. Volume 5, 1907, "Emperor and Galilean", Archer. Volume 6, 1906, "The League of Youth" and "Pillars of Society", Archer. Volume 7, 1906, "A Doll's House" and "Ghosts", Archer. Volume 8, 1907, introductions by Archer and translations of "An Enemy of the People" by Mrs. Marx-Aveling and "The Wild Duck" by Mrs. Frances E. Archer. Volume 9, 1907, William Archer's introductions and Charles Archer's "Rosmersholm" and Mrs. F. E. Archer's "The Lady from the Sea". Volume 10, 1907, "Hedda Gabler", introduction by Archer and translation by Gosse and Archer; "The Master Builder", introduction by

1906-08—continued

- Archer, translation by Gosse and Archer. Volume 11, 1907, "Little Eyolf", "John Gabriel Borkman" and "When We Dead Awaken", by Archer. Six volumes of this edition were reissued in April, 1907.
1908. Biography, Gosse's "Ibsen"—later added to "Collected Works" as Volume 13.
1909. "The Fantasy of Peer Gynt", selections translated by Isabelle M. Pagan—Theosophical Publishing Company.
"A Doll's House", Henry L. Mencken—Volume 1 of "The Players' Ibsen"—J. W. Luce, Boston and London.
"Little Eyolf", Henry L. Mencken—Volume 2 of "The Players' Ibsen", J. W. Luce.
1910. "A Doll's House", "The Wild Duck", "The Lady from the Sea", R. Farquharson Sharp, in "A Doll's House and Two Other Plays"—Everyman's Library, J. M. Dent.
1911. "Ghosts", "An Enemy of the People", "Warriors at Helgeland", R. Farquharson Sharp, in "Ghosts and Two Other Plays"—Everyman's Library, Dent.
"Speeches and New Letters of Ibsen", Arne Kildal, with bibliography by Lee M. Hollander—F. Palmer.
1912. "From Ibsen's Workshop", notes, scenarios and drafts of Ibsen's social plays, translated by A. G. Chater and edited by Archer—Volume 12 of "The Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen", Heinemann.
"Love's Comedy", Herford—reprint by Duckworth.
"Lyrics and Poems from Ibsen", F. Edmund Garrett—Dent.
1913. "Peer Gynt", R. Ellis Roberts—Martin Secker, Modern Drama Series.
"The Pretenders", "Pillars of Society", "Rosmersholm", R. Farquharson Sharp, in "The Pretenders and Two Other Plays", Everyman's Library, J. M. Dent and Sons.
"Rosmersholm", "A Doll's House", "The Lady from the Sea", Archer, as "Ibsen's Prose Dramas" in Scott Library, Walter Scott.
"The Pretenders", Archer—Heinemann.
"Ibsen Calendar for 1914"—Palmer.
1914. "A Doll's House", "An Enemy of Society", "Ghosts", "Rosmersholm", "The Lady from the Sea", "Pillars of Society"—Henderson.
1915. "Brand", Garrett—Everyman's Library, Dent.
"Lady Inger of Ostrat", "Love's Comedy" and "The League of Youth", Sharp, in "Lady Inger of Ostrat and Other Plays"—Everyman's Library, Dent.

APPENDIX B.

PERFORMANCES OF IBSEN IN ENGLAND

1890

"Quicksands, or The Pillars of Society", version by William Archer, matinee Wednesday morning, December 15, at Gaiety Theatre.

Consul Bernick.....	Mr. W. H. Vernon
Sanstad.....	Mr. Vincent
Astrup.....	Mr. Girardot
Nilsen.....	Mr. Freeman
Johan Tønnesen.....	Mr. Arthur Dacre
Hilmar Tønnesen.....	Mr. G. Canninge
Dr. Borch.....	Mr. T. Balfour
Krup.....	Mr. G. Raiemond
Hausen.....	Mr. A. C. Hutton
Olaf.....	Master Arnold
Mrs. Bernick.....	Miss M. A. Gifford
Martha.....	Miss Fannie Addison
Lona Hessel.....	Mrs. Billington
Dina Dorf.....	Miss Cissey Grahame

1894

"Breaking a Butterfly, founded on Ibsen's 'Nora'", by Henry Arthur Jones and Henry Herman, a month's run beginning Monday, March 3, Prince's Theatre.

Humphrey Goddard.....	Mr. Kyrie Bellew
Philip Dunkley.....	Mr. H. Beerbohm Tree
Martin Grittle.....	Mr. John Maclean
Dan Bradbury.....	Mr. G. W. Anson
Flora Goddard.....	Miss Lingard
Agnes Goddard.....	Miss Helen Mathews
Mrs. Goddard.....	Mrs. Leigh Murray
Maid.....	Miss Annie Maclean

[168]

PERFORMANCES IN ENGLAND

169

1885

"A Doll's House", Henrietta Frances Lord, by amateur actors at a hall in Argyle Street.

1889

"A Doll's House", Archer, managers Mr. and Mrs. Charrington, three weeks beginning Friday, June 7, Novelty Theatre.

Torvald Helmer.....	Mr. Herbert Waring
Dr. Rank.....	Mr. Charles Charrington
Nils Krogstad.....	Mr. Royce Carteton
Porter.....	Mr. J. Luke
Mrs. Linden.....	Miss Gertrude Warden
Anna.....	Miss Blanche Everleigh
Ellen.....	Miss Mabel K. Haynes
Ivar.....	Master Lionel Calhaem
Emmy.....	Miss Amy Rayner
Bob.....	Miss Ethel Rayner
Nora.....	Miss Janet Achurch

"Pillars of Society", benefit matinee for Miss Vera Beringer, July 17, Opera Comique.

Consul Bernick.....	Mr. W. H. Vernon
Johan Tønnesen.....	Mr. J. G. Grahame
Dr. Rörlund.....	Mr. John Beauchamp
Hilmar Tønnesen.....	Mr. E. Hendrie
Aune.....	Mr. A. Wood
Krap.....	Mr. G. Canninge
Mr. Rummel.....	Mr. E. Smart
Mr. Vigeland.....	Mr. E. Girardot
Mr. Sandstad.....	Mr. Branscombe
Olaf Bernick.....	Miss Vera Beringer
Mrs. Bernick.....	Mrs. Dawes
Martha Bernick.....	Miss Robins
Dina Dorf.....	Miss Annie Irish
Mrs. Rummel.....	Miss Fanny Robertson
Mrs. Postmaster Holt.....	Miss St. Ange
Mrs. Doctor Lynge.....	Miss M. A. Gifford
Miss Rummel.....	Miss May Beringer
Miss Holt.....	Miss Bræksted
Lona Hessel.....	Miss Genevieve Ward

1890

Readings from "Pillars of Society" and "An Enemy of the People" by Mrs. Erving Winslow, Haymarket Theatre and other London halls, June.

1891

"A Doll's House", single matinee on January 27, Terry's Theatre.

Torvald Helmer.....	Mr. C. Forbes-Drummond
Dr. Rank.....	Mr. William Herbert
Krogstad.....	Mr. Charles Fulton
Mrs. Linden.....	Miss Elizabeth Robins
Nora.....	Miss Marie Fraser

"Rosmersholm", Charles Archer, afternoon performances beginning Monday, February 23, Vaudeville Theatre.

Rosmer.....	Mr. Frank R. Benson
Rector Kroll.....	Mr. Athol Forde
Ulric Brendel.....	Mr. Charles Hudson
Peter Mortensgard.....	Mr. J. Wheatman
Madame Helseth.....	Miss May Protheroe
Rebecca West.....	Miss Florence Farr

"Ghosts", Archer, Independent Theatre, single performance, Friday evening, March 13, Royalty Theatre, Soho.

Mrs. Alving.....	Mrs. Theodore Wright
Oswald Alving.....	Mr. Frank Lindo
Pastor Manders.....	Mr. Leonard Outram
Jacob Engstrand.....	Mr. Sydney Howard
Regina.....	Miss Edith Kenward

"Hedda Gabler", translation by Gosse, Miss Robins and Miss Lea producers, George Foss stage manager, five consecutive matinees beginning Monday, April 20, Vaudeville Theatre. Evening bill at Vaudeville Theatre entire month of May.

George Tesman.....	Mr. Scott Buist
Hedda.....	Miss Elizabeth Robins
Jullana Tesman.....	Miss Henrietta Cowen
Mrs. Elvsted.....	Miss Marion Lea
Judge Brack.....	Mr. Charles Sugden
Ellert Lövborg.....	Mr. Arthur Elwood
Bertha.....	Miss Patty Chapman

"The Lady from the Sea", Mrs. Marx-Aveling, director Dr. Aveling, five performances beginning Monday afternoon, May 11, Terry's Theatre.

Dr. Wangel.....	Mr. Oscar Adye
Ellida Wangel.....	Miss Rose Meller
Boletta.....	Miss V. Armbruster
Hilda.....	Miss Edith Kenward
Arnholm.....	Mr. Leonard Outram
Lyngstrand.....	Mr. H. Sparling
Ballested.....	Mr. Ernest Pattison
A Stranger.....	Mr. Charles Dalton

1891—continued

"A Doll's House", Archer, matinee June 2, Criterion Theatre.
 Torvald Helmer.....Mr. Frank Rodney
 Dr. Rank.....Mr. W. L. Abingdon
 Nils Krogstad.....Mr. Charles Fulton
 Porter.....Mr. Brooke
 Mrs. Linden.....Mrs. Lucia Harwood
 Anna.....Mrs. E. H. Brooke
 Ivar.....Master Eric Field-Fisher
 Emmie.....Miss Caryl Field-Fisher
 Maidservant.....Miss Brooke
 Nora.....Miss Norreys

1892

"A Doll's House", Mr. and Mrs. Charrington producers, several performances a week for seven weeks beginning Tuesday, April 19, Avenue Theatre.

Torvald Helmer.....Mr. Charrington
 Dr. Rank.....Mr. Charles Fulton
 Nils Krogstad.....Mr. Herbert Flemming
 Mrs. Linden.....Miss Marion Lea
 Nora.....Miss Janet Achurch

1893

"Ghosts", Independent Theatre, Mr. J. T. Grein, director, private performance, Thursday, January 26, Athenaeum, Tottenham Court Road.

Mrs. Alving.....Mrs. Patrick Campbell
 Regina.....Miss Hall Caine

"The Master Builder", Archer and Gosse, Mr. Waring and Miss Robins, directors, fortnight of matinees beginning Monday, February 20, Trafalgar Square Theatre.

Halvard Solness.....Mr. Herbert Waring
 Mrs. Solness.....Miss Louise Moodie
 Dr. Herdal.....Mr. John Beauchamp
 Knut Brovik.....Mr. Athol Forde
 Ragnar Brovik.....Mr. Philip Cunningham
 Kaja Fosli.....Miss Marie Linden
 Hilda Wangel.....Miss Elizabeth Robins

Full run at Vaudeville Theatre, Monday, March 6 to March 30.

Mrs. Solness.....Miss Elsie Chester
 Dr. Herdal.....Mr. Charles Allen
 Knut Brovik.....Mr. Charles Fulton

Other parts by same actors.

1893—continued

"A Doll's House", short run beginning March 12, Royalty Theatre.

Torvald Helmer.....	Mr. Charrington
Nils Krogstad.....	Mr. Herbert Flemming
Mrs. Linden.....	Miss Carlotta Addison
Nora.....	Miss Achurch

"The Lady from the Sea", few performances in March, Royalty Theatre.

Dr. Wangel.....	Mr. Charrington
Hilda Wangel.....	Miss Achurch

"Hedda Gabler", Miss Robins, producer, two matinees and two evening performances beginning May 29, Opera Comique.

George Tesman.....	Mr. Scott Bulst
Judge Brack.....	Mr. Charles Sugden
Ellert Løvborg.....	Mr. Lewis Waller
Hedda.....	Miss Elizabeth Robins
Mrs. Elvsted.....	Miss Marie Linden
Juliana Tesman.....	Miss Cowen

"Rosmersholm", two matinees and two evening performances, May 31, Opera Comique.

Rosmer.....	Mr. Lewis Waller
Rebecca West.....	Miss Robins
Mortensgard.....	Mr. Scott Bulst
Ulric Brendel.....	Mr. Bernard Gould
Madam Helseth.....	Miss Frances Ivor

"The Master Builder", two matinees and two evening performances, June 2, Opera Comique.

Halvard Solness.....	Mr. Lewis Waller
Mrs. Solness.....	Miss Frances Ivor
Hilda Wangel.....	Miss Robins

Act IV of "Brand" in same bill.

Brand.....	Mr. Bernard Gould
Agnes.....	Miss Robins
The Gypsy.....	Miss Frances Ivor

"A Doll's House", Italian version, Signora Eleanora Duse, producer, beginning June 9, Lyric Theatre.

Torvald Helmer.....	Signor Flavio Ando
Nora.....	Signora Duse

1893—continued

"An Enemy of the People", Mr. H. Beerbohm Tree manager, beginning June 14, Haymarket Theatre.

Dr. Thomas Stockmann.....	Mr. Tree
Peter Stockmann.....	Mr. Kemble
Morten Kill.....	Mr. Allen
Hovstad.....	Mr. Welch
Billing.....	Mr. Clark
Aslaksen.....	Mr. E. M. Robson
Captain Horster.....	Mr. Revelle
Ellif.....	Master Skelly
Morten.....	Miss Dora Barton
Mrs. Stockmann.....	Mrs. Wright
Petra.....	Miss Lily Hanbury

1894

"The Wild Duck", Independent Theatre, Mr. Grein director, three performances beginning Friday, May 4, Royalty Theatre.

Werle.....	Mr. George Warde
Gregers Werle	Mr. Charles Fulton
Old Ekdal.....	Mr. Harding Cox
Hjalmar Ekdal.....	Mr. W. L. Abingdon
Gina Ekdal.....	Mrs. Herbert Waring
Hedvig.....	Miss Winifred Fraser
Mrs. Sörby.....	Mrs. Charles Creswick
Relling.....	Mr. Laurence Irving
Molvik.....	Mr. Gilbert Trent
Graberg.....	Mr. Charles Legassick
Pettersen.....	Mr. Sydney Dark
Jensen.....	Mr. C. S. Skarkatt
Flor.....	Mr. G. Armstrong
Bale.....	Mr. Herbert Fletcher
Karpersen.....	Mr. Herbert Maule

"An Enemy of the People", Mr. Tree manager, several performances a week during dramatic season of 1894.

"A Doll's House", German version, single performance, Wednesday, November 7, Opera Comique.

Torvald Helmer.....	Herr Caesar Beck
Dr. Rank.....	Herr Rusing
Nora.....	Fraulein Eleanore von Driller

"Lille Eyolf", in Norwegian, morning of December 3, Haymarket Theatre, by amateur company.

1894—continued

"Little Eyolf", Archer, copyright performance, December 7, Theatre Royal. Cast: Mr. H. L. Braeksted, Mrs. Braeksted, Miss Braeksted, Miss Elizabeth Robins, Mr. William Heinemann, Mr. Edmund Gosse.

1895

"Rosmersholm", French version, Theatre de l'Oeuvre de Paris, M. Lugne-Poë director, from March 25 to March 30, Opera Comique.

Rosmer.....M. Lugne-Poë
Rebecca.....Mlle. Marthe Mehot

"The Master Builder", French version, Theatre de l'Oeuvre de Paris, M. Lugne-Poë director, from March 25 to March 30, Opera Comique.

Solness.....M. Lugne-Poë
Mrs. Solness.....Mme. Gay
Kaja Fosli.....Mlle. Mellot
Hilda Wangel.....Mlle. Suzanne Depres

"An Enemy of the People", Mr. Tree manager, beginning June 14, Haymarket Theatre.

1896

"Little Eyolf", matinees beginning November 23, Avenue Theatre.

Alfred Allmers.....Mr. Courtenay Thorpe
Rita.....Miss Janet Achurch
'Asta'.....Miss Elizabeth Robins
Borghelm.....Mr. Lowne
The Rat Wife.....Mrs. Patrick Campbell
Little Eyolf.....Master Stewart Dawson

Later, evening performances until December 19.

Rita.....Mrs. Patrick Campbell
The Rat Wife.....Miss Florence Farr
Remainder of the cast the same.

1897

"John Gabriel Borkman", New Century Theatre, five matinees beginning May 3, Strand Theatre.

Borkman.....Mr. W. H. Vernon
Vilhelm Føldal.....Mr. James Welch
Erhart Borkman.....Mr. Martin Harvey
Mrs. Borkman.....Miss Genevieve Ward
Ella Renthelm.....Miss Elizabeth Robins
Mrs. Wilton.....Mrs. Beerbohm Tree
Frida Føldal.....Miss Dora Barton
Maid.....Miss Marianne Caldwell

1897—continued

"A Doll's House", Independent Theatre, Miss Dorothy Leighton and Mr. Charrington managers, five matinees beginning May 10, Globe Theatre.

Torvald Helmer.....	Mr. Courtenay Thorpe
Dr. Rank.....	Mr. Charles Charrington
Nils Krogstad.....	Mr. Charles Fulton
A Porter.....	Mr. H. Davis
Nora.....	Miss Janet Achurch
Mrs. Linden.....	Miss Vane Featherstone
Anna.....	Miss Mary Stuart
Ellen.....	Miss Florence Ashton
Einar.....	Miss Ethel Rayner
Bob.....	Miss Maud Evelyn
Emmie.....	Miss Alice Scott

"The Wild Duck", Independent Theatre, Mr. Charrington director, five matinees, May 17 to May 21, Globe Theatre.

Werle.....	Mr. Leonard Outram
Gregers Werle.....	Mr. Courtenay Thorpe
Old Ekdal.....	Mr. James Welch
Hjalmar Ekdal.....	Mr. Laurence Irving
Gina Ekdal.....	Miss Kate Phillips
Hedvig.....	Miss Winifred Fraser
Mrs. Sörby.....	Miss Ffolliott Paget
Relling.....	Mr. Charles Charrington
Molvik.....	Mr. Leonard Calvert
Graberg.....	Mr. G. Edmond
Pettersen.....	Mr. J. Bertram
Jensen.....	Mr. Alfred Wyn
A Flabby Gentleman.....	Mr. G. Nix Webber
A Thin-haired Gentleman.....	Mr. Farquharson
A Short-sighted Gentleman.....	Mr. Ronald Bagnall

"Ghosts", Independent Theatre, manager Mr. Charrington, private performance, June 24.

Mrs. Alving.....	Mrs. Theodore Wright
Oswald Alving.....	Mr. Courtenay Thorpe
Pastor Manders.....	Mr. Leonard Outram
Regina.....	Miss Kingsley
Engstrand.....	Mr. Norreys Connell

1900

"The League of Youth", Incorporated Stage Society, Mr. Charrington producer, February 25, Vaudeville Theatre.

Chamberlain Bratsberg.....	Mr. G. S. Titheradge
Eric Bratsberg.....	Mr. Granville Barker
Thora.....	Mrs. C. E. Wheeler
Selma.....	Miss Winifred Fraser
Dr. Fieldbo.....	Mr. Berte Thomas
Stensgard.....	Mr. T. B. Thalberg
Monsen.....	Mr. Albert Gran
Bastian Monsen.....	Mr. Robert Farquharson
Ragna.....	Miss Nathalie Brandt
Helle.....	Mr. Dallas Anderson
Ringdal.....	Mr. A. Whitby
Anders Lundestad.....	Mr. Herbert Swears
Daniel Heire.....	Mr. Courtenay Thorpe
Madam Rundholmen.....	Miss Carlingford
Aslaksen.....	Mr. Charles Charrington
A Walter.....	Mr. Edward Knoblauch

Recitations from "Peer Gynt" in Norwegian, Mr. Albert Gran, for benefit of Omnibus Men's Superannuation Fund, December 3.

1901

"Pillars of Society", Incorporated Stage Society, directed by Mr. Oscar Asche; May 12 at Strand Theatre, May 13 at Garrick Theatre.

Consul Bernick.....	Mr. Oscar Asche
Mrs. Bernick.....	Miss Annie Webster
Olaf.....	Master George Hersee
Martha.....	Mrs. Charles Maltby
Johan Tønnesen.....	Mr. Albert Gran
Lona Hessel.....	Miss Constance Robertson
Hilmar Tønnesen.....	Mr. Bromley Davenport
Doctor Rörlund.....	Mr. Leonard Quartermain
Rummel.....	Mr. Dalziel Heron
Vigeland.....	Mr. S. B. Brereton
Sandstad.....	Mr. A. H. Leveaux
Dina Dorf.....	Miss Dora Barton
Krap.....	Mr. D. J. Williams
Aune.....	Mr. A. E. George
Mrs. Rummel.....	Miss Lucy Franklein
Mrs. Postmaster Holt.....	Miss Mabel Hardinge
Mrs. Doctor Lynge.....	Miss Sybil Ruskin
Miss Rummel.....	Miss Helen Thurby
Miss Holt.....	Miss Ethel Marcus

1901—continued

"Hedda Gabler", German version, November, St. George's Hall.
Hedda.....Fraulein Schwendemann-Pansa

1902

"The Lady from the Sea", Mrs. F. E. Archer, Incorporated Stage Society, Mr. Charrington, producer, afternoons of May 4 and 5, Royalty Theatre.

Dr. Wangel.....Mr. Norman McKinnel
Ellida Wangel.....Miss Janet Achurch
Boletta.....Miss Mary Allestree
Hilda.....Miss Muriel Ashwynne
Arnholm.....Mr. Charles V. France
Lyngstrand.....Mr. Arthur Royston
Ballested.....Mr. Lionel Belmore
A Stranger.....Mr. Laurence Irving

1903

"When We Dead Awaken", Incorporated Stage Society, Mr. G. R. Foss director, Mr. Guy Waller and Mr. A. Maurice Seaton stage managers, January 25 and 26, Imperial Theatre.

Professor Arnold Rubek.....Mr. G. S. Titheradge
Mrs. Maia Rubek.....Miss Mabel Hackney
The Inspector at the Baths.....Mr. A. Maurice Seaton
Ulfhelm.....Mr. Laurence Irving
A Stranger Lady.....Miss Henrietta Watson
A Sister of Mercy.....Miss Edith Craig

"The Vikings at Helgeland", Miss Ellen Terry producer and stage manager, costumes by Miss Edith Craig, scenery and lighting by Mr. Gordon Craig, week of April 13, Imperial Theatre.

Gunnar.....Mr. Hubert Carter
Ornulf.....Mr. Holman Clark
Sigurd.....Mr. Oscar Asche
Kore.....Mr. Mark Kinghorne
Thorolf.....Mr. Tearle
Hlördis.....Miss Ellen Terry
Dagny.....Miss Britton

"Maison de Poupee" ("A Doll's House"), adaptation by M. de Prozor, June.

Nora.....Madame Rejane

1903—continued

"Hedda Gabler", Italian version, week of October 5, Adelphi Theatre.

Hedda.....Signora Eleanora Duse

1905

"Die Wildente" ("The Wild Duck"), the Andresen-Behrend Company, March 3, Great Queen Street Theatre.

Gina Ekdal.....Frau Bertens

Hedvig.....Fraulein Grawz

"Hedda Gabler", Italian version, Monday, May 29, Waldorf Theatre.

Hedda.....Signora Eleanora Duse

Thea.....Signora Maty Wilson

"The Wild Duck", Mr. Barker and Mr. Vedrenne producers, six matinees beginning October 17, the Court Theatre.

Werle.....Mr. Oscar Adye

Gregers Werle.....Mr. Scott Buist

Ekdal.....Mr. A. E. George

Hjalmar Ekdal.....Mr. Trevor Lowe

Mr. Granville Barker

Gina Ekdal.....Miss Agnes Thomas

Hedvig.....Miss Dorothy Minto

Mrs. Sörby.....Miss Ada Ferrar

Relling.....Mr. Matheson Lang

Molvik.....Mr. Norman Page

Graberg.....Mr. Frederick Lloyd

Pettersen.....Mr. C. L. Delph

Jensen.....Mr. R. F. Knox

Another Walter.....Mr. L. Hamer

Karperson.....Mr. Edmund Gwenn

Flor.....Mr. Kenneth F. Foss

Balle.....Mr. Norman Page

Another Gentleman.....Mr. Lewis Casson

"An Enemy of the People", Mr. Tree producer, November 2 through January, 1906, His Majesty's Theatre.

Thomas Stockmann.....Mr. H. Beerbohm Tree

Aslaksen.....Mr. E. M. Robson

Mrs. Stockmann.....Miss Rosina Filippi

Petra.....Miss Margaret Halston

Morten Kilb.....Mr. Shelton

Billing.....Mr. Nigel Playfair

1906

"Lady Inger of Ostrat", Incorporated Stage Society, Mr. Herbert Jarman producer, Mr. James Auning stage manager, January 28 and 29, Scala Theatre.

Finn.....	Mr. Kenelm Foss
Blörn.....	Mr. W. R. Stavely
Elina Gyldenlöve.....	Miss Alice Crawford
Lady Inger Gyldenlöve.....	Miss Edyth Olive
Einar Huk.....	Mr. C. L. Delph
A Retainer.....	Mr. Talbot Homewood
Olaf Skaktavl.....	Mr. Alfred Brydone
Nile Lykke.....	Mr. Henry Ainley
Jens Bielke.....	Mr. Charles A. Doran
Nils Stensson.....	Mr. Harcourt Williams

"An Enemy of the People", Mr. Tree producer, Spring of 1906.

"Rosmersholm", German version, week of May 14, Great Queen Street Theatre.

Rosmer.....	Herr Andreson
Rebecca.....	Fraulein Gademann

1907

"Hedda Gabler", Mr. Barker and Mr. Vedrenne producers, series of matinees beginning March 5, Court Theatre.

George Tesman.....	Mr. Trevor Lowe
Judge Brack.....	Mr. James Hearn
Ellert Lövborg.....	Mr. Laurence Irving
Hedda Tesman.....	Mrs. Patrick Campbell
Mrs. Elvsted.....	Miss Evelyn Weedon
Miss Juliana Tesman.....	Miss Adela Measor
Berta.....	Miss Mary Raby

"The Master Builder", English Drama Society, Mr. Nugent Monck director, eight performances beginning May 20, Bijou Theatre, Bayswater.

1908

"Rosmersholm", week beginning February 10, Terry's Theatre.

Rosmer.....	Mr. Eille Norwood
Rector Kroll.....	Mr. Fulton
Brendel.....	Mr. Hignett
Mortensgard.....	Mr. Gwenn
Rebecca.....	Miss Florence Kahn

1909

"The Master Builder", Tuesday afternoon, March 30, King's Theatre, Hammersmith.

Halvard Solness.....Mr. Rathmell Wilson
Hilda Wangel.....Miss Jessica Solomon

"An Enemy of the People", Mr. Tree producer, Afternoon Theatre at His Majesty's Theatre, May.

Thomas Stockmann.....Mr. Tree
Peter Stockmann.....Mr. Louis Calvert
Aslaksen.....Mr. Robson
Petra.....Miss Beatrice Forbes-Robertson

"Hedda Gabler", Madame Lydia Yavorska (Princess Bariatinsky) producer, beginning December, 1909, Afternoon Theatre at His Majesty's Theatre.

Hedda.....Madame Yavorska

1910

"John Gabriel Borkman", Miss Rosina Filippi, an instructor in acting, producer, Tuesday, October 26.

Borkman.....Mr. Franklin Dyall
Mrs. Borkman.....Miss Filippi
Foldal.....Mr. Cargill
Ella Rentheim.....Miss Emily Luck
Mrs. Wilton.....Miss Amy Ravencroft

1910-12

Practically all of Ibsen's plays performed in the entirety or in part by the Ibsen Club, each play having a single performance at the Club's studio or at the little Rehearsal Theatre, on Sunday evenings.

1911

"Ghosts", produced by Miss Andrews, benefit of Charing Cross Hospital, Wednesday, January 4, Hotel Cecil.

Mrs. Alving.....Miss Janet Achurch
Oswald.....Mr. Courtenay Thorpe

"John Gabriel Borkman", Miss Filippi producer, January 26.

Borkman.....Mr. James Hearn
Erhart.....Mr. Owen Nares
Foldal.....Mr. Campbell Cargill
Mrs. Borkman.....Miss Rosina Filippi
Ella Rentheim.....Miss Emily Luck
Mrs. Wilton.....Miss Catherine Nesbitt
Frida Foldal.....Miss Benvenuta Filippi

1911—continued

"A Doll's House", Madame Yavorska producer, February 14 to May 20. Royalty Theatre, February 14 to March 10.

Torvald Helmer.....Mr. Stephen Ewart
Dr. Rank.....Mr. Franklin Dyall
Mrs. Linden.....Miss Rosalind Ivan
Nora.....Madame Yavorska

Court Theatre, March 10 to April 1.

Torvald Helmer.....Mr. Ben Webster
Dr. Rank.....Mr. Halliwell Hobbes
Krogstad.....Mr. Rothbury Evans
Mrs. Linden.....Miss Ivan
Nora.....Madame Yavorska

Court Theatre, April 1 to May 20.

Torvald Helmer.....Mr. Norman Trevor
Dr. Rank.....Mr. Franklin Dyall
Krogstad.....Mr. Frederick Lloyd
Mrs. Linden.....Miss Janet Achurch
Nora.....Madame Yavorska

"Peer Gynt", Ibsen Club, at Studio, Sunday, February 26; at Rehearsal Theatre, April 23; Miss Catherine Lewis producer.

Peer Gynt.....Miss Pax Robertson
The Lean Person.....Mr. Maurice Elvey
Aslak, the Smith.....Mr. Townley Searle
The Button Moulder.....Mr. Townley Searle
Solveig.....Miss Peck
Solveig's Mother.....Miss Brazalgette

"The Master Builder", Miss Lillah McCarthy producer, Little Theatre, beginning March 28.

Knut Brovik.....Mr. Leon M. Lion
Kaja Fosli.....Miss Christine Silver
Ragnar Brovik.....Mr. Harcourt Williams
Halvard Solness.....Mr. Norman McKinnel
Mrs. Solness.....Miss Katherine Pole
Dr. Herdal.....Mr. Claude King
Hilda Wangel.....Miss Lillah McCarthy

"Hedda Gabler", Madame Yavorska producer, beginning May 20, Kingway Theatre.

George Tesman.....Mr. F. Kinsey Pelle
Hedda Tesman.....Madame Yavorska
Juliana Tesman.....Miss Florence Hayden
Mrs. Elvsted.....Miss Helen Haye
Judge Brack.....Mr. Franklin Dyall
Eilert Lövborg.....Mr. Lewis Willoughby
Bertha.....Miss Jean Bloomfield

1911—continued

"Rosmersholm", Adelphi Repertory Company, May 28, Little Theatre.

Rosmer.....Mr. Leigh Lovel
 Pastor Kroll.....Mr. Herbert Beaumont
 Peter Mortensgard.....Mr. Penna
 Rebecca West.....Miss Octavia Kenmore

"Olaf Lilliekrans", Ibsen Club, Rehearsal Theatre, single performance on June 11. Translation made by Miss C. A. Arfwedson.

Ingeborg.....Miss Catherine Robertson
 Arne fra Guldvik.....Mr. Townley Searle
 Alfild.....Miss Pax Robertson
 Olaf.....Mr. Valentine Penna
 Dame Kirsten Lillekrans.....Miss Gladys Jones
 Hemming.....Mr. Ned Liewellyn

"Ghosts", Adelphi Play Society, Rehearsal Theatre, June 25.

Mrs. Alving.....Miss Alice Chapin
 Oswald Alving.....Mr. Maurice Elvey
 Pastor Manders.....Mr. Leslie Gordon
 Jacob Engstrand.....Mr. James L. Bale
 Regina.....Miss Cicely Fairfield

"The Wild Duck", last four acts, The Drama Society, Tuesday, November 14, Studio Theatre on Victoria Street.

Gina.....Miss Catherine Lewis
 Hjalmar.....Mr. Rathmell Wilson

"Hedda Gabler", Drama Society, Clavier Hall, Tuesday, November 25.

Tesman.....Mr. Claude Sykes
 Judge Brack.....Mr. Leigh Lovel
 Ellert Lövborg.....Mr. Rathmell Wilson
 Hedda.....Miss Octavia Kenmore

"When We Dead Awaken", Ibsen Club, December 17.

Rubek.....Mr. Charles Robert
 Mala.....Miss Pax Robertson
 A Stranger Lady.....Miss Catherine Lewis

1912

"Rosmersholm", Miss Kenmore and Mr. Lovel producers, March 26.

Rosmer.....	Mr. Lovel
Rector Kroll.....	Mr. George Owen
Brendel.....	Mr. William Podmore
Peter Mortensgard.....	Mr. Frederick Meade
Madame Helseth.....	Miss Catherine Maynard
Rebecca West.....	Miss Kenmore

"A Doll's House", April.

Torvald Helmer.....	Mr. Leigh Lovel
Dr. Rank.....	Mr. George Owen
Krogstad.....	Mr. Frederick Meade
Mrs. Linden.....	Miss Catherine Maynard
Nora.....	Miss Octavia Kenmore

"The Hero's Mound", translation by Miss C. A. Arfwedson, selections from "Peer Gynt" and "A Doll's House", Ibsen Club, May 30.

"Peer Gynt", Adelphi Play Society, June 2, Little Theatre. Dances arranged by Miss Margaret Morris.

Peer Gynt.....	Mr. Maurice Elvey
Solveig.....	Mrs. Frank Bailey
Ase.....	Miss Leah Hannan

"A Doll's House", October 14, Court Theatre.

Torvald Helmer.....	Mr. Leigh Lovel
Nora.....	Miss Octavia Kenmore

"Brand", William Wilson translation, Mr. W. G. Fay producer, Play Actors, November 11, Court Theatre.

Brand.....	Mr. Saintsbury
Mayor.....	Mr. Clifton Alderson
Agnes.....	Miss Phyllis Relph
Gerd.....	Miss Mignon Clifford

"Hedda Gabler", Drama Society, November 26, Clavier Hall.

George Tesman.....	Mr. Spencer Carpenter
Hedda Tesman.....	Miss Octavia Kenmore
Juliana Tesman.....	Miss Doris Digby
Mrs. Elvsted.....	Miss Rita Spontl
Judge Brack.....	Mr. Henry Wynn
Ellert Løvborg.....	Mr. Rathmell Wilson
Bertha.....	Miss Viola Rose-Lewis

1912—continued

In December:

George Tesman.....Mr. Claude Sykes
 Judge Brack.....Mr. Leigh Lovel
 Mrs. Elvsted.....Miss Daisy Rose

Other roles the same.

1913

"The Pretenders", Mr. Frederick Harrison and Mr. William Archer managers, stage managers Mr. S. H. Sime and Mr. Joseph Harker, costumes Mr. Sime, music Mr. Norman O'Neill, Thursday, February 13 to March 10, Haymarket Theatre.

Hakon Hakonsson.....Mr. Basil Gill
 Inga of Varteig.....Miss Yvonne Orchardson
 Dagfinn.....Mr. Montagu Love
 Earl Skule.....Mr. Laurence Irving
 Lady Ragnhild.....Miss Helen Haye
 Sigrid.....Miss Tita Brand
 Margrete.....Miss Netta Westcott
 Nicholas Arnesson.....Mr. William Haviland
 Sira Villam.....Mr. Henry Hargreaves
 Ivar Bodde.....Mr. Henry Crocker
 Master Sigard of Brabant.....Mr. Frank Ridley
 Guthorm Ingesson.....Mr. Robin Shiells
 Gregorius Jonsson.....Mr. Ewan Brook
 Paul Flida.....Mr. E. A. Warburton
 Chief Bratte.....Mr. Allan Jeayes
 Jatgeir Skald.....Mr. Guy Rathbone
 Ingeborg.....Miss Magda McIntosh
 Peter.....Mr. E. Ion Swinley

"The Wild Duck", Lillah McCarthy and Granville Barker producers, St. James Theatre, December 1, 3, 6.

Werle.....Mr. Herbert Hewetson
 Gregers Werle.....Mr. E. Harcourt Williams
 Ekdal.....Mr. H. O. Nicholson
 Hjalmar Ekdal.....Mr. Leon Quartermain
 Gina Ekdal.....Miss Clare Greet
 Mrs. Sörby.....Miss Evelyn Weedon
 Relling.....Miss Balliol Holloway
 Molvik.....Mr. Neville Garthside
 Graberg.....Mr. J. P. Turnbull
 Pettersen.....Mr. Allan Jeayes
 Hedvig.....Miss Lillah McCarthy

1913—continued

"When We Dead Awaken", Drama Society, Tuesday, December

2.

Professor Arnold Rubek.....	Mr. Rathmell Wilson
Mrs. Maia Rubek.....	Miss Pax Robertson
A Stranger Lady.....	Miss Winefrida Borrow

1914

"A Doll's House", Miss Filippi producer, January 28, Vaudeville Theatre.

Torvald Helmer.....	Mr. James Berry
Krogstad.....	Mr. Patric Curwen
Nora.....	Mrs. J. H. Sinclair

"Ghosts", Mr. Grein director, private performances at Court Theatre on April 26 for Society of Women's Suffrage, and on May 19. Public performance, Haymarket Theatre, Tuesday, July 14.

Fru Alving.....	Miss Bessie Hatton
Oswald.....	Mr. Leon Quartermain
Pastor Manders.....	Mr. J. Fisher White
Jacob Engstrand.....	Mr. Stacy Aumonier
Regina.....	Miss Dorothy Drake

INDEX

- Abbey Theatre, 149.
 Abingdon, W. L., 102.
 Academy, The, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 32, 113, 114, 115, 117, 151, 155.
 Achurch, Janet, 25, 80, 82, 83, 91, 92, 97, 100, 101, 103, 106, 107, 116, 158.
 Actor's Church Union, 152.
 Adams, W. Davenport, 30, 121.
 Adelphi Play Society, 113.
 Adelphi Repertory Company, 112, 113.
 "Agatha," Henderson, 31.
 Ainley, Henry, 108.
 Amateur performances of Ibsen, 112-114.
 Andresen, 110.
 Ansley, F. (see Guthrie, Thomas Anstey)
 Antoine, 87.
 Archer, Charles, 66, 67, 71.
 Archer, Mrs. F. E., 66, 71.
 Archer, William, 23, 24, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 58, 59, 63, 64, 76, 79, 80, 82, 88, 93, 99, 103, 104, 116, 154, 156, 157; critical duels, 42-46; leader of Ibsenites, 27, 28; meeting with Ibsen, 63; as translator, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 76, 79.
 Arnold, Matthew, 130, 132.
 Asbjørnsen, 15.
 Asche, Oscar, 106, 111.
 Asquith, 54.
 Athenaum, 21, 25, 29, 38, 46, 49, 52, 65, 76, 77, 78, 84, 85, 88, 89, 90, 96, 97, 100, 104, 106, 107, 111, 112, 114, 122, 138, 146, 149.
 Aumonier, Stacy, 115.
 Avenue Theatre, 91, 122.
 Baker, Elizabeth, 147, 148.
 Balfour, 99.
 Balzac, 156.
 Barlatinsky, Countess (see Yavorska, Lydia).
 Barker, Granville, 106, 109, 110, 141, 147, 148.
 Barnett, O., 122.
 Barrie, J. M., 54, 121, 148.
 Baudelaire, 89.
 "Beata," Fryers, 127.
 "Becket," Tennyson, 129.
 Becque, 131.
 Beerbohm, Max, 30, 112.
 Bell, Mrs. Hugh, 122.
 Bellew, Kyrie, 77.
 "Benefit of the Doubt, The," Pinero, 141, 143.
 Benson, Frank R., 85, 94.
 Beringer, Mrs. Oscar, 84.
 Beringer, Vera, 84.
 Besant, Sir Walter, 126, 127.
 Bettany, W. A. Louis, 26, 138, 139.
 Bishop of London, 152.
 Bjerregaard, 15.
 "Black Cat, The," Todhunter, 146.
 "Blot on the 'Scutcheon, A," Browning, 129.
 Borsa, Mario, 75, 152.
 Boucquault, Dion, 129, 130.

- Bouchier, Arthur, 123.
 Bowles, Gilbert, 153.
 Boyesen, Hjalmar Hjorth, 55.
 Boyle, William, 149.
 "Brand," 11, 13, 14, 18, 23, 143;
 performances, 94, 95, 113;
 translations, 15, 16, 19, 22, 23,
 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72.
 Brandes, Georg, 53, 136.
 "Breaking a Butterfly," Jones
 and Herman, 77, 78, 79, 80, 83.
 Brighthouse, Harold, 147.
 Bright, Addison, 29.
 British Society of Scandinavians, 21.
 Brown, Campbell Rae, 121.
 Browning, Robert, 129.
 Buchanan, George, 142.
 Buchanan, Robert, 122.
 Bulst, Scott, 89, 94.
 Bulwer-Lytton, 129.
 Burney, Estelle, 123.
 "Bygmaster Solness," (see
 "Master Builder, The")
 Byron, 24.
 Caine, Hall, 102.
 Calvert, Louis, 116.
 Cambridge University, 159.
 Camelot Series, 64.
 Campbell, Mrs. Patrick, 100, 101,
 102, 110, 111, 116, 158.
 "Candida," Shaw, 109, 145.
 Cannan, Gilbert, 147.
 Carter, Hubert, 11.
 Carter, Huntley, 41, 135.
 "Catilina," 20, 70, 71, 73, 118;
 translation, 21, 23.
 Celtic Renaissance, 149.
 "Chains," Baker, 148.
 Chambers, C. Haddon, 148.
 "Change," Francis, 148.
 Chapman, Patty, 89.
 Charrington, Charles, 25, 80, 82,
 83, 88, 91, 103, 104, 105, 106,
 116, 158.
 Charrington, Mrs. (see Achurch,
 Janet).
 Chatterton, 30.
 Cheney, Ednah Dow, 127.
 Chlapowski, Charles Bozenta,
 77.
 Clark, Holman, 111.
 "Collected Works of Henrik
 Ibsen, The," 70, 71, 72, 73.
 Colum, Padraic, 149.
 Corelli, Marie, 33.
 Cornhill Magazine, 16.
 Court Theatre, 109, 110.
 Cowen, Henrietta, 89.
 Craig, Edith, 111.
 Craig, Gordon, 111.
 Cran, Mrs. George, 98, 99.
 Criterion Theatre, 122.
 Critic, The, 55, 138, 157, 159.
 "Crusaders, The," Jones, 143.
 Dahl, Johan Andreas, 16, 57.
 Daily Chronicle, 34.
 Daily Telegraph, 31, 38, 49.
 Danby, Frank, 87.
 Dancy, G. W., 44.
 "David Ballard," McEvoy, 146.
 Dawson, Stewart, 101.
 "De Unges Forbund (see
 "League of Youth, The")
 "Degeneration," Nordau, 50, 51,
 52.
 Dickens, Charles, 42.
 "Digte," 12; translations, 21, 23,
 69, 70, 72.
 "Doll's House, A," 25, 26, 27, 44,
 48, 51, 55, 123, 124, 126, 127,
 128, 131, 134, 135, 136, 138, 144,
 145, 147, 148, 155, 160; perfor-
 mances, 25, 36, 77, 80, 81, 82,
 83, 84, 85, 88, 91, 92, 95, 96, 97,
 103, 104, 113, 114, 119, 120;

- translations, 34, 57, 58, 59, 60,
61, 65, 66, 78, 80.
- "Doll's House, The—And Af-
ter," Besant, 126.
- Drake, Dorothy, 115.
- Dublin Review, 53.
- Dumas, 134, 141.
- Duse, Eleanore, 95, 96, 97, 98.
- Echo, The, 30.
- "Edderfuglein," 21.
- "Eldest Son, The," Galsworthy,
146.
- Ellis, Havelock, 64.
- Elwood, Arthur, 89, 94.
- "Emperor and Galilean," 18, 19,
23, 118; translations, 20, 23,
57, 66.
- "En folkefiende" (see "Enemy
of the People, An")
- "En fugle vise," 21.
- "Enchanted Sea, The," Martyn,
149.
- "Enemy of Society, An," (see
"Enemy of the People, An").
- "Enemy of the People, An," 51,
134, 146; performances, 98, 99,
119; translations, 64, 66, 71.
- English Drama Society, 112.
- English Illustrated Magazine,
126.
- English Socialist Party, 34.
- English Stage, Triviality of,
155-156.
- "Entartung," (see "Degenera-
tion").
- Ervine, St. John G., 149.
- Esmond, H. V., 146.
- "Et dukkehjem" (see "Doll's
House, A").
- Evening Standard, 37.
- Everson, Louise, 77.
- Fabian, Society, 34, 40.
- Farr, Florence, 85, 88, 94, 101.
- "Feast at Solhoug, The," 13,
118; translations, 71, 72.
- Filippi, Risina, 114.
- Fillon, 28, 42.
- Fitz Maurice, George, 149.
- Forbes, Drummond C., 84.
- Forde, Athol, 85.
- Fortnightly Review, 16, 19, 22,
32, 35, 43, 44, 48.
- Fox, 47.
- Francis, J. O., 148.
- Fraser, Marie, 84, 88.
- Fraser, Winifred, 102, 103, 104,
105, 106.
- Fraser's Magazine, 11, 15, 16,
19, 22.
- French criticism of Ibsen, 43,
44.
- French performances, 97.
- "From Ibsen's Workshop," 71.
- "Fru Inger til Ostraat" (see
"Lady Inger of Ostraat").
- "Fruen fra havet" (see "Lady
from the Sea, The").
- Fryers, Austin, 127.
- "Fugitive, The," Galsworthy,
146, 148.
- Fulton, Charles, 84, 85, 102, 103,
104.
- Gaiety Theatre, 76.
- Galsworthy, John, 137, 140, 145,
146, 148.
- Garrett, F. E., 68, 69, 72.
- Garrett, Mrs. F. E., 72.
- Garrick Theatre, 123.
- "Gay Lord Quex, The," Pinero,
153.
- "Gengangers" (see "Ghosts")
- Gentleman's Magazine, 29, 48,
83, 85, 89, 138.
- George, A. E., 110.
- German performances, 97.
- "Getting Married," Shaw, 144,
145.

- "Ghost, A—a Spirited Sketch not by Ibsen," 122.
- "Ghosts," 37, 38, 39, 43, 40, 51, 53, 54, 74, 91, 121, 134, 137, 145, 146, 149, 154, 155; performances, 36, 37, 87, 88, 89, 102, 105, 113, 115, 120, 158; translations, 57, 61, 62, 63, 66.
- "Gifted Lady, The," Buchanan, 122.
- Gilbert, W. S., 130, 137.
- "Gildet paa Solhoug" (see "Feast at Solhoug, The").
- Gill, Basil, 114.
- Gladstone, 48.
- Globe, The, 30.
- Globe Theatre, 128.
- Goethe, 156.
- Gosse, Edmund, 11-23, 25, 27, 54, 75; criticisms of Ibsen, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 71; as translator, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 57, 66, 69, 71, 74; visits to Norway, 11, 12, 16.
- Gould, Bernard, 94, 95.
- Gran, Albert, 106.
- "Grangecolman," Martyn, 149.
- "Greatest of These, The," Grundy, 140, 147.
- Green, Mrs. J. R., 87.
- Grein, J. T., 37, 86, 88, 103, 106, 115, 116, 158.
- "Grierson's Way," Esmond, 146.
- Grundy, Sydney, 130, 137, 139, 140, 147.
- Guthrie, Thomas Anstey, 123, 124, 125, 126.
- Hackney, Mabel, 107.
- "Haermedene paa Helgeland" (see "Vikings at Helgeland, The").
- Hankin, St. John, 147.
- Hansen, 15.
- Hapgood, Norman, 146.
- Hardy, Thomas, 54, 87.
- Harris, Frank, 87.
- Hatton, Bessie, 145.
- Hauptmann, Gerhardt, 145.
- Haviland, William, 114.
- Haymarket Theatre, 114, 115.
- Hearn, James, 110, 111.
- "Heather Field, The," Martyn, 149.
- Hebbel, 131.
- "Hedda Gabler," 39, 40, 43, 48, 51, 108, 121, 126, 133, 136, 137, 142, 143, 144, 147; performances, 36, 39, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 110, 111, 112, 120; translations, 66, 71, 74.
- "Hedda Gabler," Guthrie, 124, 125.
- Hegel, 13.
- Heinemann, 70.
- Henderson, Isaac, 31.
- Henney, Rosa, 121.
- "Hereditary," (see "Gifted Lady, The").
- Herford, Charles Harold, 33, 42, 68, 69, 71.
- Herman, Henry, 77, 78, 79, 80.
- "Hero's Mound, The," 113, 114, 118.
- Hervey, R. H., 25, 82.
- "Hindle Wakes," Houghton, 148.
- "His House in Order," Pinero, 141.
- Houghton, Stanley, 147, 148.
- House of Commons, 153.
- Hughes, George, 128.
- Humphrey, G., 122.
- Hurst, J. P., 121.
- "Hypocrites, The," Jones, 143.
- Ibsen: birthdays, 20, 54; defense of prose, 19; letters to Archer, 52, 65, 90, to Brandes, 52, 53,

- 136, to Gosse, 13, 15, 18, 19, to Hegel, 13, on socialism, 34; speeches, at Christiania, 36, to students in Norway, 131; visit to Norway, 20; proposed visit to London, 52; 53; death, 54; climax, use of, 136, 137; comparison with Shakespeare, 40, 41; dialogue, use of, 135, 136; dramas of business, 147; dramatic secrets, use of, 136; adequacy of performances in England, 80, 81, 117, 118; inadequacy of English translations, 55, 56, 66, 67, 68, 73, 74, 75; influence of Ibsen characters on English drama, 147, 148; influences on Ibsen, 131; middle class, treatment of, 133, 146, 147, 156; physical action, lack of, 135; presented as propagandist, 29, 34, 35, 36, 41, 55, 60, 61, 159, 160; realism, 133, 134, 146; social ideas, use of, 134; stage directions, use of, 148, 149; success on continent, 151, 152; success of plays in book form, 151; symbolist, 34; technique, 134, 137, 148; woman's poet, 60.
- "Ibsen," Gosse, 71.
- Ibsen Club, The, 113, 114.
- "Ibsen's Ghost, or Toole up to Date," Barrie, 121.
- "Ibsen's Letters," Laurvik and exposition, use of, 135; hatred of Ibsen, 24; heredity, use of, 134; iconoclasm, 132, 133; in-Morrison, 70.
- "Ibsen's Lyrical Poems," Streatfield, 70.
- "Ibsen's Prose Dramas," 65.
- "Ideal Husband, An," Wilde, 141, 148.
- Impressionists, 50.
- Incorporated Stage Society, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109.
- Independent Theatre, The, 45, 86, 87, 88, 91, 102, 103, 104, 105, 158.
- "Iris," Pintero, 141, 142, 143.
- Irving, Laurence, 49, 50, 102, 104, 105, 107, 108, 110, 111, 114.
- Ivor, Frances, 94, 95, 128.
- James, Henry, 33.
- "Jerry Builder Solness," Bell, 122.
- "John-a-Dreams," Chambers, 148.
- "John Gabriel Borkman," 147; performances, 101, 114, 117; translations, 69.
- Johnstone, A., 21.
- Johnstone, Eliza, 121.
- Jones, Henry Arthur, 54, 77, 78, 79, 80, 86, 87, 137, 139, 140, 143, 144.
- Jones, Wilton, 121.
- "Judah," Jones, 143, 144.
- "Justice," Galsworthy, 146.
- "Kaerghendens komedie" (see "Love's Comedy").
- Karma, doctrine of, 61, 62, 63.
- "Kejser og Galilaer" (see "Emperor and Galilean")
- Kendal, 84.
- Kenmore, Octavia, 112.
- Kildal, Arne, 70.
- Kinghorne, Mark, 111.
- Kingsley, Alice, 122.
- "Kongs-emnerne" (see "Pretenders, The").
- Knight, Joseph, 29.
- Knowles, Sheridan, 129.
- "Lady from the Sea, The," 74, 145, 147, 149; performances, 90, 91, 106, 120; translations, 65, 66, 71.

- "Lady Inger of Ostrat," performances, 108; translations, 66, 71.
 Lady's Pictorial, The, 29.
 Land and Water, 30.
 Landstead, M. B., 15.
 Lang, Mathewson, 110.
 Last of the DeMullins, The," Hankin, 147.
 Laurvik, John Nilsen, 70.
 Lea, Marion, 89, 91, 116, 158.
 "League of Youth, The," 11, 17, 22, 134, 136; performance, 106; translation, 65.
 Leigh, J. H., 109.
 Leighton, Dorothy, 103.
 Liberty, 52.
 Licensed Victualler's Gazette, 37.
 Liddon, Canon, 152.
 "Lille Eyolf" (see "Little Eyolf").
 Linden, Marie, 94.
 Linden, Paul, 46.
 Lingard, 77.
 "Little Eyolf," 51, 53, 54, 135, 144, 146, 147; performances, 53, 59, 100, 101; translation, 69.
 London Figaro, 30.
 London Illustrated News, 81.
 Long run system, 157.
 Lord, Henrietta Frances, 34, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 78.
 Lovel, Leigh, 112.
 "Love's Comedy," 11, 17, 23, 118; translations, 17, 18, 19, 23, 69, 71, 72.
 Lowe, Trevor, 110, 111.
 Lugne-Poë, 97.
 "Lyrics and Poems from Ibsen," Garrett, 72.
 McCarthy, Desmond, 110, 111.
 McCarthy, Justin Huntley, 29, 48, 85, 90, 138.
 McEvoy, Charles, 146.
 McKinnel, Norman, 107.
 "Madras House, The," Barker, 148.
 "Maison de Poupée" (see "Doll's House, A").
 Maltby, Mrs. Charles, 106.
 "Man and Superman," Shaw, 23, 144.
 Manet, 24.
 Martyn, Edward, 149.
 Marx-Aveling, Eleanor, 64, 65, 71, 127.
 "Master Builder, The," 46, 47, 48, 49, 74, 122, 125; performances, 46, 91, 93, 94, 95, 97, 112; translations, 48, 69, 71.
 Maude, Cyril, 122.
 "Mayne, Rutherford," 149.
 Meredith, George, 87.
 Merritt, Paul, 129.
 "Michael and His Lost Angel," Jones, 143, 144.
 "Midchannel," Pinero, 141, 142, 143.
 "Miles Divon," Cannan, 147.
 Minto, Dorothy, 110.
 "Mob, The," Galsworthy, 146.
 Modjeska, 77.
 Moe, 15.
 Montague, C. E., 105, 106, 136.
 Moore, George, 33, 87, 147.
 Morgenblad, 14.
 Morrison, Mary, 70.
 Mortimer, James, 30.
 Morton, Edward, 32, 33.
 "Mr. Punch's Pocket Ibsen," Guthrie, 23.
 "Mrs. Dane's Defense," Jones, 143, 144.
 "Mrs. Warren's Profession," Shaw, 145.
 Munch, 12, 15.
 Murray, T. C., 149.

- "Naar vi doede vaagner" (see "When We Dead Awaken").
 Nesbit, J. F., 32, 158.
 New Century Theatre, 101.
 Nietzsche, 24.
 Nineteenth Century, The, 130.
 "Nora," (see "Doll's House, A").
 "Nora, or the Bird Cage," Guthrie, 123, 124.
 "Nora's Return," Cheney, 127.
 Nordau, Max, 50, 51, 52.
 Norreys, 91.
 "Norwegian and Swedish Poems," J. A. D., 16, 57.
 "Notorious Mrs. Ebbsmith, The," Pinero, 141, 143.
 Novelty Theatre, 25, 31, 83, 138.
 Ny illustreret Tidende, 20.
 Observer, 31.
 "Olaf Liljekrans," 113, 118.
 Olive, Edyth, 108.
 Opera Comique, 93.
 Outram, Leonard, 104, 128.
 Oxford University, 159.
 "Paa Vilderne," 72.
 Paget, Pfolliott, 104.
 "Pair of Ghosts, A—After Ibsen," Brown, 121.
 Pall Mall Gazette, 29, 37.
 Parker, Louis Napoleon, 65.
 Partridge, Bernard, 123.
 "Peer Gynt," 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23; performances, 113; translations, 18, 23, 67, 68, 71, 72.
 Pettit, Henry, 129.
 Phelps, Mrs. Edmund, 122.
 "Philanderer, The," Shaw, 144.
 Phillips, Kate, 104.
 Phillips, Stephen, 137.
 Pictorial World, 29.
 "Pill Doctor Henda," Guthrie, 123, 125, 126.
 "Pillars of Society," 22, 23, 51, 136, 143, 147, 148, 155; performances, 63, 76, 77, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 106, 120, 143; translations, 63, 64, 65, 66.
 Pinero, Arthur Wing, 44, 46, 54, 86, 87, 137, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 156.
 Planché, 129, 130.
 Play Actors, 113.
 Pre-Raphaelites, 50.
 "Pretenders, The," 11, 13, 15, 16, 23; performance, 114, 115; translations, 21, 23, 66, 72.
 Prince's Theatre, 77.
 Printing of Plays, 137, 151.
 "Profligate, The," Pinero, 44, 141, 142.
 Prose Dramas of Henrik Ibsen, 66.
 Punch, 123.
 Puritanism, 152, 153.
 Quarterly Review, 40.
 Quartermaine, Leon, 115.
 "Quicksands," (see "Pillars of Society").
 Raleigh, Cecil, 87.
 Rathbone, Guy, 114.
 Ray, Catherine, 20, 23, 57.
 Reade, Charles, 129.
 Realism, tendency towards, 129-131.
 "Regeneration," 52.
 Rehearsal Theatre, 113.
 Réjane, 97.
 Roberts, R. Ellis, 68.
 Robertson, Constance, 106.
 Robertson, Pax, 113.
 Robertson, Thomas, 129, 130.
 Robins, Elizabeth, 85, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 100, 101, 116, 122, 158.
 Robinson, Lennox, 149.

- Robson, E. M., 98.
 "Rosmer of Rosmersholm," Fryers, 127.
 "Rosmersholm," 36, 37, 43, 112, 123, 126, 133, 135, 136, 137, 143, 144, 147, 149; performances, 36, 85, 86, 88, 93, 94, 97, 113, 120; translations, 65, 66, 71.
 "Rosmersholm," Guthrie, 123.
 Royal Subsidized Theatre, Amsterdam, 86.
 Royal Theatre, 38.
 Royston, Arthur, 107.
 "Rutherford and Son," Sowerby, 147.
 St. George's Hall, 123.
 St. Paul's Magazine, 49.
 "Saints and Sinners," Jones, 143.
 "Samfundets stotter" (see "Pillars of Society").
 Saturday Review, 29, 41, 47, 48, 83, 84, 85, 97, 100, 101, 104, 105, 113, 117.
 "Schatten, Der" Linden, 47.
 Schwach, 15.
 Scott, Clement, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 38, 45, 46, 77, 151; leader of anti-Ibsenites, 30, 31, 32, 158, 159.
 Scott, Walter, 64, 65.
 Scribner, 131, 134.
 "Second Mrs. Tanqueray, The," Pinero, 46, 141, 142, 143.
 Shakespeare, 41, 50.
 Shaw, George Bernard, 28, 29, 31, 37, 42, 52, 54, 83, 84, 93, 97, 100, 101, 104, 105, 109, 117, 127, 137, 140, 144, 145, 148, 158; presentation of Ibsen as a propagandist, 29, 34, 35, 55, 160; comparison of Ibsen and Shakespeare, 40, 41.
 Shelley, 24.
 Shelton, G., 121.
 "Shewing up of Blanco Posnet," Shaw, 145.
 "Silver Box, The," Galsworthy, 146.
 Sime, 115.
 Sims, G. R., 129.
 Shade, Joep, 30.
 Smith, S., 153.
 Soutar, Robert, 123.
 South African War, 153.
 Sowerby, Githa, 147.
 Speaker, The, 28.
 Spectator, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22.
 "Speeches and New Letters of Ibsen," Hildal, 70.
 Spence, E. F., 29, 83, 90, 154.
 Spender, A. F., 53.
 Sporting and Dramatic News, 37.
 Stage Society News, 86.
 Standard, The, 32.
 Star, The 28, 48, 159.
 Steinway Hall, 121.
 Sterling, Antoinette, 84.
 Streatfield, R. A., 70.
 "Strife," Galsworthy, 146.
 "Strike at Arlingford, The," Moore, 147.
 Sugden Charles, 89, 90, 94.
 Sunday Sun, 29.
 Sunday Times, 31.
 Swinburne, 39.
 Symonds, Arthur, 33, 155.
 Talfourd, Sergeant, 129.
 Taylor, Tom, 129.
 Tearle, 111.
 "Tempter, The," Jones, 139.
 Tennyson, Alfred, 129.
 "Terje Vigen," 16, 21, 23, 72.
 Terry, Ellen, 111, 116, 158.
 Theatre, The 25, 26, 31, 39, 42, 44, 47, 48, 66, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83,

- 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98,
103, 138, 142, 154.
Theatre de l'Oeuvre de Paris,
97.
"This Generation," Fox, 147.
Thomas, Agnes, 110.
Thomas, May, 32, 33, 158.
Thorpe, Courtenay, 100, 103,
104, 105, 106.
"Threepenny Bits," Zangwill,
123.
"Thunderbolt, The," Pinero,
141, 142, 143.
Time, 58.
Times, The, 28, 32, 114, 115, 159.
Titheradge, G. S., 106, 107.
To-Day, 61.
Todhunter, John, 146.
Tolstoi, 50.
Toole, J. L., 121.
Toole's Theatre, 121.
Topical Times, 36.
Trafalgar Square Theatre, 93.
"Translations from the Norse,
by a B. S. S., 21, 57.
Tree, H. Beerbohm, 77, 98, 99,
116, 118, 119, 158.
Truth, 31.
Vanbrugh, Irene, 121.
Vanbrugh, Violet, 122, 123.
Vaudeville Theatre, 89, 90, 93.
Vaughan, Susie, 128.
Vedrenne, 109, 101.
Vernon, Henry, 101, 128.
"Vikings at Helgeland, The,"
11, 20, 65, 111, 112.
"Vildanden," (see "Wild Duck,
The").
"Vosey Inheritance, The," Bar-
ker, 141, 147.
"Vuggevisse," 21.
Wagner, Richard, 24, 39, 50.
Walkley, Arthur Bingham, 28,
29, 32, 40, 48, 55, 138, 157, 158,
159.
Waller, Lewis, 94.
Ward, Genevieve, 101.
Waring, Herbert, 81, 82, 91, 92,
93, 103, 116, 122, 142, 158.
Waring, Mrs. Herbert, 102, 103.
Watson, Alfred, 32, 159.
Watson, Henrietta, 107, 108.
Watson, Malcolm, 138.
Weber, T., 57, 58, 59.
Wedmore, 32, 33, 42, 158.
Weekly Despatch, 80.
Welch, James, 104, 105, 122.
Welhaven, 12, 15.
Wergeland, 12, 15.
Westcott, Netta, 114.
Westminster Review, 107.
"When We Dead Awaken," 69,
107, 112, 113.
White, J. Fisher, 115.
Whitman, Walt, 39.
"Wild Duck, The," 49, 50, 51,
108, 125, 133, 134, 149, 155; per-
formances, 49, 97, 102, 104, 110,
112; translations, 66, 71.
"Wild Duck, The," Guthrie, 125.
Wilde, Oscar, 137, 140, 148, 156.
Williams, Harcourt, 108.
Wills, W. G., 129.
Wilson, William, 66, 67, 68.
Winter, Hjeltn, 20.
World, The, 103, 104.
Wright, Mrs. Theodore, 105.
Wyes, 122.
"Younger Generation, The,"
Houghton, 147, 148.
Yavorska, Lydia, 97, 98.
Zangwill, Israel, 123.
"Zaza," 153.

240209

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

This book is due on the last **DATE** stamped below.

DEC 11 1974

DEC 4 REC'D

MAY 12 1989

JUN 2 1989 REC'D

MAY 30 '90

JUN 6 1990 REC'D

JUN 4 1991

MAY 30 1991 REC'D

MAR 18 '94

MAR 12 1994 REC'D

MAR 25 '96

MAR 26 1996 REC'D

50m-12,'70(P1251s8)2373-3A,1

PT8900.G7F7



3 2106 00225 3281

